

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 25 August 1993

The **SPEAKER (Hon. N.T. Peterson)** took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

SOUTHERN DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

A petition requesting that the House urge the Government to retain surgical and obstetric services at Southern Districts War Memorial Hospital was presented by the Hon. M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

CRAIGBURN FARM

A petition requesting that the House urge the Government to preserve Craighburn Farm as open space was presented by the Hon. M.J. Evans.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the Notice Paper, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 15, 18, 19, 22, 24, 27, 30, 31, 77 and 79.

PUBLIC SECTOR REFORM

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: In delivering my Meeting the Challenge economic statement on 22 April this year I outlined the Government's decision to embark on a program of public sector reform as part of the revitalisation of the South Australian economy.

In providing a fundamental change in the way this State's public sector is structured and operates, I announced that the number of public sector departments, excluding central agencies, would be reduced from 30 to 12 by 30 June 1994. At that time, I announced the first three amalgamated agencies: the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Primary Industries, and the Department of Education, Employment and Training. Legislation also is before the Parliament to establish the Southern Power and Water Authority by amalgamating the Electricity Trust of South Australia and the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Today I release details of phase two of the Government's public sector reform program. This continues the process of reducing the number of operating and central agencies by amalgamating existing Government departments into single new departments and by the formation of strategically related groups of agencies into portfolio areas.

The changes will provide savings by reducing unnecessary administrative duplication without affecting front line services and will improve processes for policy development and implementation. The moves, to operate from 3 September, involve decisions about the next six line agencies and a reduction in the number of central agencies from three to two.

The new line agencies are as follows:

The Department of Environment and Natural Resources, which will undertake the management and conservation of South Australia's environment and natural resources (water, air, land, flora and fauna). The department will be based on the existing Department of Environment and Land Management with expanded responsibility for integrated natural resource management and program coordination currently shared between five existing departments. The Chief Executive Officer will be Mr Dennis Mutton.

The Department of Justice, which will include administration of the law, Consumer Affairs and Correctional Services. The department will amalgamate the Attorney-General's Department, the Department of Correctional Services, the Electoral Department, the Department of Public and Consumer Affairs and the Police Complaints Authority. It will have an administrative relationship with the Legal Services Commission. In recognition of the importance of the Consumer Affairs functions, a specific Ministry of Consumer Affairs and the position of Commissioner of Consumer Affairs will be retained. The Chief Executive Officer will be Mr Kym Kelly.

The Department of Transport, which will integrate air, sea, road and rail transport. The department will amalgamate the Department of Road Transport, the Department of Marine and Harbors, the State Transport Authority and the Office of Transport Policy—agencies which have been working together since November 1992 to enable the strategic development of the new department. The Chief Executive Officer will be Mr Rod Payze.

The Department of Emergency Services, which will ensure a coordinated response to emergencies experienced by the community and develop coordinated prevention strategies spanning fire, accident and crime. The new department will coordinate the Police Department (which includes the State Emergency Service), the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the Country Fire Service and the South Australian Ambulance Service. The operational identity of each service will be preserved and the head of each agency will continue to report to the Minister on operational matters. SACON Security will be incorporated into the Police Department. The Chief Executive Officer will be Mr Andrew Strickland.

The Department of Labour and Administrative Services, which will operate to provide cost-competitive, quality services to Government agencies and ensure the maintenance of relevant standards in industry. The new department will be formed from the Department of State Services, the Department of Housing and Construction (excluding its security services) and the Statewide labour relations sections from the existing Department of Labour. The Chief Executive Officer will be Ms Kay Schofield.

The portfolio of business and regional development, a coalition of departments and agencies that will remain as separate entities reporting to their present Ministers, but with improved policy coordination on key strategic issues. The portfolio will include the Economic Development Authority, the Office of Business and Regional Development, the South Australian Tourism Commission, the Department of Mines and Energy and the Department of the Arts and Cultural Heritage. Mr Bill Cossey will be portfolio coordinator for the new grouping.

The number of central agencies will be reduced from three to two—the portfolio of Premier and Government Management and the Treasury Department. The portfolio of Premier and Government Management will be formed from the

Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the functions of the Commissioner for Public Employment and the Government Workers Compensation and Rehabilitation Office (both currently within the Department of Labour), the Office of Public Sector Reform and the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs (OMEA). Although being part of the portfolio grouping, the Office of Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs will remain a separate entity reporting directly to the Premier. The Minister of Public Sector Reform also will continue in his current role.

The strategic management of the public sector's human resources will be achieved within the portfolio through an Office of Government Management, comprising the Office of Public Sector Reform and the relevant components from the current Department of Labour. The office will be headed by a new Commissioner for Public Employment, Ms Sue Vardon.

The administrative arrangements for the Treasury Department are unchanged, but the department will take an expanded role in the central arrangements for better coordination of Government activities, the development and implementation of financial reform and the administration of the public corporations legislation.

Portfolio areas which remain unchanged include health, family and community services. The Government is awaiting the recommendations of the Select Committee into Health Administration before making decisions in this area.

Mr Speaker, the changes that I have outlined will require some ministerial changes, with the Attorney-General taking control of correctional services and the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety assuming control of State Services and Housing and Construction as part of the new Department of Labour and Administrative Services. These changes will also occur on 3 September.

As I have already indicated, although the departmental functions of consumer affairs, arts and cultural heritage, mineral resources and public sector reform will be moving into new amalgamated groupings, the current Ministers will remain in control of those areas.

It is important to stress that, while we have reduced the number of Government departments and the number of people administering them, we are not reducing the quantity or quality of the services we provide. However, those changes have not been without cost. We have had to set a target of eliminating 3 000 public sector jobs by the end of the 1993-94 financial year. All of the reductions are on a voluntary basis and the Government will meet the target.

Following funding decisions at the recent Premiers Conference I indicated that the Government may have to cut a further 600 public sector positions. After careful examination, the Government believes that that reduction would place undue pressure on core services and would be inconsistent with our determination not to reduce or threaten the high level and quality of service that this State is widely acknowledged to provide. For this reason I today announce that the Government has decided that it would be inappropriate to set a target higher than the 3 000 positions outlined in Meeting the Challenge.

Central to the Government's public sector reform agenda is the present and future prosperity of the State. Significant benefits from the reform will include administrative savings, streamlined Government decision making and much better portfolio coordination. Importantly, the changes will also result in an improvement in Government services to business

and the wider community, and they will see the public sector play an enhanced role in giving South Australia a competitive edge.

WILPENA PROJECT

The Hon. M.K. MAYES (Minister of Environment and Land Management): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: On 17 August 1993 in this place the member for Bragg asked a question about the proposed Wilpena development.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I told him we were going to, if that comes as a surprise. In particular, the member for Bragg asked whether the proponent, Ophix Finance Corporation, would forfeit all rights to the project if it failed to complete stage 1 of the project before 30 June 1994, and in that event whether the Government would be liable to pay any compensation to Ophix. The development of the Wilpena project is governed by a lease agreement between Ophix and the Minister of Environment and Land Management, signed on 16 January 1989.

This lease, which is a public document, amongst other matters prescribes that a resort of the size described in the second schedule of the lease must, unless otherwise agreed between the parties in writing, be built by 30 June 1994. Failure to comply with this requirement would be a nominated breach of an essential term of the lease, and would therefore render the lease liable for cancellation. The lease makes no provision for the Government to pay compensation in the event of the proponent breaching an essential term of the lease. This matter has not been raised in any discussions between the Government and Ophix. I am informed that Ophix remains committed to the project and has outlaid considerable funds to progress the project to its current stage. Ongoing discussions are taking place with the proponent as to the ability of Ophix to develop the project to the level required by the second schedule by 30 June 1994.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr De LAINE (Price): I bring up the sixth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee on the Hindmarsh Island bridge inquiry interim report and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Does the Government share the view of Ms Sue Vardon about public sector job cuts, and is her appointment as Commissioner for Public Employment part of a secret Government agenda to implement further massive job cuts if this Labor Government should ever be returned to office—which it will not be?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: As Commissioner for Public Employment, Ms Sue Vardon takes over the responsibility

of implementing the Government's public sector job cuts. Ms Vardon has already expressed the view to quite a number of people that the State public sector has 12 000 jobs which are surplus to current requirements.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The facts are that the new role taken over by Ms Sue Vardon is to administer the 3 000 target which was set in Meeting the Challenge and which we will meet by the middle of next year; and that, Mr Speaker, is it. That is the goal that we have set. That is the goal that we have not varied from, and that is the goal that the next Labor Government will adhere to. The Leader—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—makes his allegations about a secret agenda based upon some third hand comments reportedly made by Ms Sue Vardon. However, the Leader has to answer for his own comments made to the people of South Australia where he talked about cuts of between 15 per cent and 25 per cent in various Government departments. Talk about a secret agenda! The Leader is the one to talk about secret agendas, because he has them. He does them so well. On the one hand he says that he will cut 15 to 25 per cent out of Government departments and, on the other hand, when it comes to many areas of our service provision in South Australia—education and health, for example, where we do spend more than the national average—he says there are inefficiencies, and he would get rid of them if he were in Government.

If he would get rid of that if he were in Government, given that wages form the great part of the Government's budget, one does not do it in any other way than by taking people out of public employment. So, in a department like the Department of Education, Employment and Training he would take out thousands of people. That is his secret agenda on which he has not come clean.

We have a series of insubstantial policy statements from the Leader, with many holes in them and no detail. It is time that the Leader stopped this policy of his own hidden agenda, because my Government has been laying on the public record the issues that have to be faced. The budget that my Treasurer will bring down tomorrow will detail how we are meeting those goals that were set in the budgetary statement in April. We have laid on the public record what needs to be done. That is what has to happen and what will happen under a Labor Government, and that figure is 3 000.

WORKCOVER

Mr FERGUSON (Henley Beach): Can the Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety inform the House whether he has examined the Opposition's policy on workers compensation? On 4 September last year the Leader of the Opposition was quoted in the *Advertiser* as saying that the Opposition would make a detailed announcement on its worker compensation policy before the end of that year.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I believe that during your absence a question very similar to this was asked by a member of the Government benches.

The SPEAKER: The Chair has no knowledge of that question. Can the member give me a reference to it?

The Hon. Jennifer Cashmore: *Hansard* has not been printed yet.

The SPEAKER: In that case I have no reference and I must allow the question.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I thank the member for Henley Beach for his question. I do not know in which year the Opposition will release its policy in this area.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: From the ravings and rantings of the member for Murray-Mallee, perhaps it is talking about the next century. The question is: why has the Opposition not released it? The reason is that it has not been able to write one and, if it has, it is not game to let the public of South Australia know about it. It does not want the workers to know that, if elected, it will remove the overtime payments from WorkCover, abolish the compensation for journey accidents, reduce compensation benefits to 85 per cent of the notional weekly wage after three months and to 75 per cent after 12 months, and dramatically slash benefits to employees who are partly incapacitated and unable to return to their previous employment. That is a very cruel thing to do because it will put workers out on social service.

It contrasts very clearly with the undertakings that we have given people in this State with respect to what we have been able to do with WorkCover. Since 1989-90 the claim numbers, for a number of reasons, have reduced from 56 000 to 40 000. One reason is that we have been able to introduce a bonus and penalty scheme in WorkCover. We have been able to establish national standards for occupational health and safety and target inspections from the Department of Labour, and the WorkCover organisation has established a preventions branch to assist those employers who have a poor performance in occupational health and safety to have a better one. Accidents have decreased by 10 per cent average per annum since that high point of 1989-90, and that is 50 per cent better than has been done in the eastern States.

I know that the member for Bragg, when trying to denigrate what WorkCover and our Government has done, has said that this is all due to the recession, but he never acknowledges that the actuary has advised the select committee, of which he is privileged to be a member, that 50 per cent of that reduction is because of the activities of this Government and of the WorkCover board.

We have also seen the average levy rate reduced from 3.79 per cent to 2.86 per cent in the same period. In this State we have a workers compensation system which is cheap for the employers and which provides better benefits for workers throughout the State.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume his seat. There is a point of order.

Mr LEWIS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. To my certain knowledge the question asked was 'had the Minister read the report or not?' The Minister now debates the substance of it or the lack of that substance and I do not believe that it is appropriate that he be permitted to continue.

The SPEAKER: The Chair does uphold the point of order. The Minister is debating the subject matter of the question and I would ask him to draw his response to a close.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In closing, I would make the following observation. The Industries Assistance Commission inquiry into workers compensation sought information around the States and it was made clear to the commission that, if we want to have a very cheap scheme, we go for insurance but, if we want to reduce accidents and costs and improve productivity, we would go for a scheme like the scheme we have in South Australia. That is what we are about in South Australia—ensuring that there is a cheap scheme that provides good benefits and

reduces injuries so that the public of South Australia are not injured.

GROUP ASSET MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Treasurer. What was the loss of the Group Asset Management Division, the so-called bad bank, for 1992-93 and what valuation is the bad bank now carrying on its books for the Myer-Remm centre? The half year result of the bad bank was a loss of \$146 million. In reporting the result, the Chief Executive, Mr Ruse, said that the bad bank was still carrying the Remm project at a value of \$290 million. However, since the half yearly report, the Valuer-General's valuation of the property has been reduced by a further \$50 million to \$100 million, and it has been revealed in the Auditor-General's report that the State Bank's financing of the project was estimated to peak at \$744 million in March 1992. These figures indicate that a further substantial downgrading needs to be made in the bad bank's accounts for the value of the Myer-Remm Centre.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: The annual report will be presented tomorrow.

DISABLED PERSONS

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): My question is directed to the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations. What assistance is this Government providing to councils to address the problems experienced by people with disabilities in accessing parking spaces in shopping centres and supermarkets? This matter has been raised by concerned constituents in my electorate on a number of occasions having particular regard to permits and policing.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for her interest in this matter, which is one about which all members receive questions from time to time. Part of my ministerial responsibilities are for legislation governing on and off street parking laws, namely, the Local Government (Parking) Regulations Act and the Private Parking Areas Act which govern off street parking. Over many years this Government has responded to the needs of people with disabilities, whether this be in the area of Home and Community Care services or by continuing to emphasise the need for equal access arrangements for people with disabilities in our community.

Recently an updated booklet 'Guidelines on Parking for People with Disabilities' was issued. In June this year I distributed copies to all South Australian councils and many other organisations and community groups, including some located interstate. These guidelines provide a useful reference point for those involved in the provision of parking for people with disabilities, including councils, property developers, architects, construction engineers and shopping centre and car park managers. The material encompasses information on many relevant aspects, ranging from Australian standards to signage, permit concerns and access design. An overview of related legislation is also incorporated in the information that I have distributed.

The guide was first brought into being in 1991 following consultation and deliberation of the parking project steering committee, which included representatives of disabled persons' organisations in South Australia. The promulgation of this valuable reference both furthers this Government's

commitment to the needs of people with disabilities and, importantly, provides a convenient and practical handbook for the use of diverse community groups, including councils.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I direct my question to the Treasurer. Has the South Australian Government Financing Authority further reduced the value of the 333 Collins Street, Melbourne, project that it is carrying on its books and, if so, what is the value? SAFA has reviewed its valuation of the Collins Street project in finalising its 1992-93 accounts. The SGIC was forced to buy the property through the exercise of a put option for a net \$465 million in July 1991. Accumulated losses to South Australian taxpayers on this project already total more than \$300 million. A valuation of \$250 million was put on the property when it was transferred to SAFA's books last year and I have been told that this valuation has been further reduced in settling the 1992-93 accounts.

The Hon. FRANK BLEVINS: All those details will be given tomorrow.

URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr McKEE (Gilles): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations inform the House of what steps, if any, the Government is taking to make sure that all South Australians have the opportunity to live in quality urban developments such as Golden Grove? I heard recently that there are up to four households bidding for each new courtyard block released onto the market at Golden Grove. My concern is that all South Australians should have access to good housing in well planned urban environments.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for this important question. It is interesting that in Golden Grove a new size housing allotment has been pioneered and is now being followed throughout Australia. It has proved to be a very successful venture and opportunity for many more people to gain access to affordable housing.

Golden Grove is an excellent example of the way in which this Government has worked with the private sector and the community to build safe, secure and affordable housing and pleasant living environments. I think it is fair to say that, if it were not for the vision of various Labor Administrations in the 1970s, we might not have Golden Grove as we know it today. This makes it even more bewildering why members opposite, as recently as last week, indicated that, if they were to obtain government, they would move very quickly to dismantle the structures that have provided successful joint ventures such as Golden Grove, Regency Gardens, Montague Farm and Seaford.

This week I had the pleasure of breaking the ground for the construction of the one-thousandth house for the South Australian Housing Trust in Golden Grove. The development, on the corner of Golden Way and Grove Way, will eventually provide homes for 18 South Australian families. The underrated feature of the Golden Grove development is the successful integration of public and private housing. The original indenture agreement provided for up to one-quarter of the houses to be designated as public housing. Given that the vast majority of public housing tenants are dependent on very modest incomes, this approach has made it possible for low-income South Australians to enjoy the same quality of life as is being enjoyed by the broader community.

The development on Golden Way reinforces the policy of integration with architectural features such as quoin clay brick walling and tiled carports, ensuring that the units complement surrounding developments. Housing underpins the quality of life for all Australians. It is not good enough to leave important aspects of the housing industry to the vagaries of the free market, because it is always the poorest and the weakest who miss out. This Government has shown how public and private interests can operate together in a framework which provides opportunities to all South Australians. I only hope that members opposite will very soon tell us what their policies will be with respect to public housing.

STATE BUDGET

Mr OLSEN (Kavel): I address my question to the Premier. Given the continuing stagnant economy, will he give details of the belated budget initiative to create 1 000 jobs? I possess a document which reveals that the Premier is to claim in tomorrow's budget that, as a result of a specific initiative, 1 000 jobs will be created.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I wonder where the member for Kavel was yesterday when I was detailing the growth in exports in South Australia over the past three years. Where has he been when I have replied to members in this House on gross domestic product—

Members interjecting:

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —in South Australia?

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We have actually done better on the latest figures released on gross State product, taking the national deflator into account, than Australia at large has done over the past couple of years. So, the start of the question from the member for Kavel—

Mr Olsen interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel is out of order again.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —was quite wrong on that point. The member for Kavel will, like every other member in this place, have to wait until tomorrow when the Treasurer brings down the budget. But it is interesting that Question Time is about trying to ask useful questions to get information, and every year that I have been here and members across the Chamber have been in Opposition they always, on the day before, and during Question Time on the day of the budget, waste their time asking questions knowing that the answer will be, 'Wait until the budget comes out.' That is an absolute waste.

I would have thought Opposition members had other things they could usefully ask about that would not bring the refrain, which it must bring, 'You'll have to wait until the budget comes out.' Mr Speaker, I will make the point again: the start of the member for Kavel's question is quite wrong. We are in a recovery mode—it is a tender recovery mode, I acknowledge that point, but we are in a recovery mode—and the budget brought down by the Treasurer tomorrow will be a financially and socially responsible budget and will assist in the economic recovery of this State.

FOREST IRRIGATION

The Hon. D.J. HOPGOOD (Baudin): My question is directed to the Minister of Public Infrastructure. What lessons have been learned from the hardwood irrigation afforestation trial which has been under way for some time on E&WS land at Bolivar?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for Baudin for his question. Indeed it is a very timely question, because arrangements are currently being made by E&WS and the Woods and Forests Division of the Primary Industries Department for a technical seminar and open day at the Bolivar wood lot.

The open day is scheduled for 26 September and the seminar will be held during the morning, which will allow people who want technical information—people such as environmental managers, to be there and to view the various experiments and obtain technical information. As most members will be aware, the Bolivar trial demonstrates the use of reclaimed water from the Bolivar sewage treatment works for large-scale irrigation wood lots, which means, of course, the on-land disposal of treated sewage.

The trial plantation established in 1990 covers 14 hectares and contains over 31 000 Australian native hardwood trees. During the afternoon the general public will have the opportunity to tour the plantation and observe the growth of the various species after three years of irrigation with reclaimed water. The project staff will also be on hand and will be available to inform people of the practical application of using reclaimed water, providing details of the scientific program which covers the soil, water and the trees. The intention is to widely publicise the open day to ensure that as many people as possible are given the opportunity to take the advantage of attending.

MEDICARE REBATES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): My question is directed to the Premier. Will the South Australian Government urge the Federal Government to review its decision to remove Medicare rebates for eye examinations by optometrists, particularly in the interests of dyslectic children and the elderly? I have been told that hundreds of dyslectic children will be socially and educationally disadvantaged by this provision in the Federal budget. Young children need eye examinations costing about \$150 per consultation so that glasses can be prescribed to enable them to read. These young people initially require one or two examinations and then testing once a year. They then have to pay the \$250 to \$300 for glasses. A southern suburbs dyslexia centre has informed me that this will seriously disadvantage those who need the most and can afford the least.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: When the budget was brought down and we looked at the various details, we were aware of that and very concerned about it. My colleague the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services also was concerned about that matter. We have had other representations made to us. Fortunately we did not wait for the Opposition to take as long as they have to raise their concerns. We had already expressed our concerns and indeed we have already written—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: —to the Federal Government—

Mr Meier interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder is out of order.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD:—making such representations and asking for further discussions on that particular area because we share the concerns of many South Australians who have expressed their anger at that particular budgetary decision in the Federal budget.

SOUTH ROAD

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Can the Minister of Public Infrastructure advise the House whether a decision has been taken by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to discontinue the undergrounding of electrical wires as part of the widening of South Road when that widening proceeds north of the Torrens River? If these wires were not to be placed underground what would be their route between Port and Torrens Roads?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have been advised by ETSA that the Torrens to Port Road section of South Road is scheduled for reconstruction in 1995-96. As a result, ETSA and the Department of Road Transport are examining the options for relocating electricity cables in this locality but I must stress that at this point no decisions have been made.

ETSA's mains in this section of South Road are in two categories: there are 66kV (kilovolt) transmission lines on each side of South Road and 11kV and 415v distribution lines, mainly on the western side. ETSA has estimated that if both the 66kV lines were placed underground the cost to the Department of Road Transport would be about \$4.6 million, compared to a cost of about \$1 million if the lines were relocated overhead.

ETSA has had an established practice for some time of not undergrounding 66kV transmission lines unless other parties meet the additional costs. An example I can give the honourable member is that in the case of South Road, between Daws Road and Anzac Highway, the cost was met by the Department of Road Transport, local government and ETSA, but the ETSA contribution only extended to the cost that it would have had to meet in upgrading the line in any case; in other words, it was cost neutral to the Electricity Trust.

When one considers that the cost of undergrounding 66kV line is a minimum of \$1 000 per metre, one can understand ETSA's reluctance to do this except at other people's cost. So, the case that the honourable member refers to involving the underground relocation option for the distribution lines will need to be referred to the Power Line Environment Committee. However, ETSA has also advised that it is examining options to rationalise its 66kV lines in this section of South Road to the western side using double circuit overhead construction, which is 266kV lines on the same circuit on the same poles, but again no decision has been made.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr MATTHEW (Bright): Why did the Minister of Emergency Services announce on 9 August 1993 that the amalgamation of the State Emergency Services and the Country Fire Services is likely when a consultant's report released just six days later recommends a totally different action? And what other consultants' recommendations does the Minister plan to override without discussing the issues?

The Minister is quoted in the *Advertiser* on 9 August 1993 as saying he, and I quote:

I would imagine the Country Fire Service would likely be the predominant emergency service in the country. It would take over the SES facilities, assets and volunteers.

However, a review of the organisation structure and design of the South Australian Police Department, prepared by consultants Management and Technology Consulting, recommends bringing the SES into the operational arm of the Police Department to, and I quote:

further facilitate day-to-day cooperation between the service and operational commands.

I am reliably informed that the Minister did not discuss his proposal with the SES, the CFS or police and as at today still has not discussed it with the SES. SES volunteers have labelled this as yet another attack on volunteers by the Labor Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Do not believe everything you read, because that is not an accurate quote of what I said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: What I said—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: Well, you listen to me and I will tell you what I said. What I have said came about as a consequence of discussions that I had with CFS and SES officers around the State. In fact, already there have been amalgamations between the CFS and the SES, involving sensible and comfortable voluntary arrangements for the delivery of emergency services in the community—and the volunteers have agreed to those arrangements.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: You will have your turn. What I propose is that, now that the Premier has announced the new Emergency Services Department, our new CEO, Mr Andrew Strickland, along with the other heads of services involved—the Commissioner of Police and the heads of the Country Fire Service and the SES—undertake discussions in the community to look at the best way of delivering those services.

That is what I was floating—the concept of providing for the community best value for the dollar in respect of those emergency services members of the public need. I am certain the new CEO of the department will in fact embark on that matter in a consultative way, involving full discussions with all the communities throughout South Australia.

Bearing in mind some changes coming in terms of funding from the Federal Government for the SES, we have to look at the best way of providing those services, and that will include all those volunteers involved in the exercise. We have to look at the best way of providing those services through the assets we have at our disposal. We must ensure, of course, that we make use of those assets in the best interests of all South Australians, so that when we are confronted with emergencies we will see the quality services being provided in the best possible way.

That is what I was putting to the community and I continue to stand by those comments: that it is very important that we examine the most effective method of delivering those services. I look forward to having the opportunity to discuss with all the community groups involved—the SES, CFS and the police—the provision of those services in the best possible way.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Premier take up with his relevant Ministers and, in particular, the Federal Government the plight of many superannuation policy holders? In recent times I have had such policy holders show me the surrender or rollover details of their policies. Despite paying up to \$4 000 per year in one instance for 12 years or more, the rollover amount is in fact less than the amount that has been paid in. In addition, gatekeeper's fees threaten to eat up another 20 to 25 per cent of what is left.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: I thank the honourable member for his question, which is a very important one that affects many people. I know that many other members in this place have had constituents in like positions come to them. I have certainly had constituents come to me in positions such as this, where they plan ahead for their retirement, making significant financial contributions every year in the belief that a certain amount of money will be available for them to have as part of their retirement package, only to find that if, for example, they have to either leave the scheme early or roll it over, they have nowhere near what they thought they would have and that they have actually been taken into a very bad investment indeed. Not only may they not have had any positive return at all, or only a slight positive return: in some cases they might actually have had, as the member for Playford indicates, a total decline in the amount of money they take out compared to the money they have paid in, notwithstanding the added loss of forgone interest.

So, I certainly do share the honourable member's concern on this matter, and I have expressed that concern to constituents who have come to see me. I will refer the matter to the Attorney-General and to the Minister of Consumer Affairs to see what possibilities there are at the State level of this matter being followed through. However, the honourable member quite rightly makes reference to the Federal Government and I will refer it there to see what action can be taken at that level as well.

CAVAN CORRECTION CENTRE

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I direct my question to the Minister of Family and Community Services. Is it a fact that the Cavan Correction Centre has been built within budgeted cost, as claimed by the Minister, because SACON has not paid contractors for work done on the construction? I am informed that one major contractor has not received over \$500 000 owed to him, despite the fact that he has been working on the centre for over nine months. This failure to pay raises the question: how many others remain unpaid? Does this explain how the Minister was able to claim that the centre was built within budget and not with a major blowout of \$2.8 million, as widely believed?

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: The honourable member obviously is very disappointed that the centre has come in on time and on budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: He is so disappointed by the success of this project that he has been forced to raise this kind of rumour not only in this place but also in the media. Notwithstanding the fact that I have previously made a statement on this matter quite publicly in response to the first fictional story, which appeared in the media a month or so ago, that the project was in fact \$2.5 million over budget, I can assure this House that that project has indeed come in on

time and on budget. In fact, within a week or two young people will be held in that centre in a very secure and appropriate facility.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: Because the honourable member has again raised this matter and taken up the time of the House in relation to it, I will of course refer the particular question about that payment to my colleague the Minister in charge of that department. However, the project is within budget, it is on time and it is my pleasure to reiterate that to this House.

SUBMARINE PROJECT

The Hon. J.P. TRAINER (Walsh): Can the Minister of Business and Regional Development advise whether the submarine project is finished well on time and well within its budget, or has it fulfilled the predictions of the former and current Deputy Leader of the Opposition, recorded in *Hansard* in 1987, that the submarine contract could 'confirm in the minds of the world that South Australia is truly second class, that it cannot be trusted and that it prefers to wallow in mediocrity [rather] than grasp with both hands the opportunities that have been given to it'? On that occasion, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition also said:

The union movement is already jockeying for position in an attempt to obtain the cream off the submarine cake. Not once have I heard a commitment from that quarter that it will ensure a peaceful and productive work force with quality control standards to the fore.

It sounds as though the Opposition is well and truly sunk.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I hope, in adopting my usual statesmanlike stance, that there will be bipartisan support at least for the next few days about this project. The other night I went through *Hansard* volumes for the past few years and night after night, week after week, month after month and year after year members opposite not only white-anted the Grand Prix but attacked the submarine project.

We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's comments attacking the work force. I hope he will come down there on Saturday for the launch and meet those workers and congratulate them on being part of the effort in bringing in this historic project on time and on budget. I would like to invite the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel, in particular. Members would recall the headline 'Olsen disappointed' in the *News* on the day that we won the submarine project. He was disappointed that we had not won more of the project, for goodness sake.

We would also, of course, remember the remarks of Alexander Downer at the time of the 1985 campaign. On several occasions he went to the media in an attempt to torpedo South Australia's getting the project, saying that we were not equipped to get it, that everyone knew it was an election stunt and that, after all, it was going to go to New South Wales because that State had the edge.

Then we had the then Leader of the Opposition—there have been quite a few of them—and I believe the next Leader of the Opposition, the member for Kavel, whose staff were out there spreading stories to journalists that the submarine project's coming to South Australia was a figment of the electoral imagination of the member for Ross Smith. I am prepared to hold a seminar to educate members opposite

about the benefits of this great project to this State and I am prepared to hold that seminar before the weekend.

However, I hope that those who do have the guts to show up at the launching will be bipartisan in their support. We will applaud them for being so. We will also applaud the former Premier's role and that of Jim Duncan and others, as well as the role of the present Premier. I hope members opposite will also come down and apologise to the work force and congratulate them on a great effort—well done!

Mr Hamilton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr SUCH (Fisher): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training assure the House that any relocation of the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education to Chesser House in the city will not contravene guidelines laid down by the Federal Government on the allocation of funds to the States under its TAFE resources agreement, which prevents Federal money being spent on premises already owned? I am told that the \$19.7 million available from the Federal Government for the relocation or expansion of the Adelaide institute is not available for use on property already owned by the State Government. I point out that the land on which Chesser House is built was bought by the State Bank on 31 May. Despite the Minister's denials, several educationists have told me that the Government wishes to use Federal funds to renovate Chesser House for the Adelaide institute so that the State Bank's outlay can be repaid.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I do not know where the honourable member has been, because I have already been asked this question. I have made it very clear that, first, a decision has not been taken and, secondly, every one of the conditions of the \$19.7 million given to the State for this stage 5 will be negotiated so that we do meet the Federal Government's requirements. Let me say that, if we did not ensure that our stage 5 proposal was the very best option open to the students of the Adelaide institute, we would be criticised by the Opposition. I have written to the Chair of the institute council and informed them that we will ensure the best decision is taken. At this point I will repeat what I have said previously, because obviously the member was not in the House, although I thought it was he who asked me the question on that day. I will check in *Hansard* because, if he did ask me the question on that day, obviously he has a problem—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: He does have a problem, but obviously it is more serious than we first thought. I repeat: a decision has not been taken. However, I will ensure, and I put it categorically on the record, that the very best decision will be taken in the interests of quality education training—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader is out of order.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: —for the students of the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education. I wonder whether the member opposite could give the people of this State the same sort of assurance. We have not seen his policies about further and vocational education, because he does not have any. The Liberal Party simply does not have any policies, and it is very interesting that we hear the Leader of the Opposition

talk about hidden agendas. If anyone in this State has a secret agenda, it is the Leader of the Opposition—we know it and so do the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will resume her seat. The member for Murray-Mallee.

Mr LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question, as I recall, was about whether or not Federal money would be spent on a particular site for a TAFE college and not whether the Opposition has any policies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member making a point of order of that?

Members interjecting:

Mr LEWIS: If the member for Albert Park would like to go to the Mickey Mouse show—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the member wishes to take a point of order, he will be specific with respect to that. If he is making a point of order on relevance—

Mr LEWIS: My point of order is that the Minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will listen. If the member is taking a point of order on relevance, I uphold the point of order. The Minister was then commencing to debate the issue. If that was the point of order, I uphold it. If it was not that, I do not know what it was.

Mr LEWIS: It was that, Sir.

Members interjecting:

SCHOOLS, NON-GOVERNMENT

Mr De LAINE (Price): Can the Minister of Education, Employment and Training advise whether there has been an increase in real terms in the level of financial support for non-Government schools during the 10 years in office of successive Labor Governments and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. The answer is very clearly 'Yes'. Successive Labor Governments have increased the level of support and recognised the importance of the partnership which now exists between the Government and the non-Government sectors. In 1981 the total grant under the last Liberal Government was \$14.8 million, or the equivalent of \$29 million in 1991-92 dollar terms. The actual amount granted by this Government in 1991-92 was \$49.7 million. This represents an increase of 70 per cent in real terms, while enrolments increased by 48 per cent. This is a real increase from \$706 per student to \$843 dollars per student in 1991-92 dollar terms, and it reflects cost increases across the two systems.

I must say that it is a record of which we, on this side of the Parliament, are very proud. We work very closely with the non-Government sector to ensure that, unlike every other State in this country, we have a public education system and a non-Government education system. They work very carefully and cooperatively together to provide the highest quality of education right across the whole system, whether it is private or whether it—

Mrs Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: It is very interesting what your Party has done: it has done absolutely nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister will direct her response through the Chair and not across the Chamber.

The Hon. S.M. LENEHAN: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I was just diverted for a moment. I was delighted to read in the Liberal Party Vision document—and it certainly did not have much vision in it—that it would support a system which

allows freedom of choice for parents between a Government system and an independent system. What the document does not say, of course, is how it intends to fund the systems, given the statement, which the Leader of the Opposition has yet to refute, that it will cut recurrent expenditure from between 15 and 25 per cent. How it would fund such a commitment is a mystery to me and to the people of South Australia.

STATE SUPPLY ACT

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee): Is the Minister of State Services aware that section 23(1) of the State Supply Act 1985 does not require a report on the operation and effectiveness of that Act to be prepared until 31 December 1994, 16 months away, and if so, why is he undertaking the review now? Why is he pressing members of Parliament and the general public to meet a 3 September deadline for submissions about the department, so that it can be completed before the end of this year, less than four months away?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am delighted to get this question from the member for Murray-Mallee, because I am sure that if we were doing this next year he would be standing up here and asking, 'Why have we not been given ample time to comment on the role of the State Supply Act and its review?'

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He does not have time. I am prepared to make officers available to assist you in preparing your presentation, if that will assist you, Peter. The member for Murray-Mallee will never walk alone again, I promise you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park is out of order.

The Hon. JENNIFER CASHMORE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Minister is addressing the member not by the name of his electorate but directly by his first name and referring to him directly.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Minister is well aware of the requirement in this House.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I apologise, Sir. It is just that I am trying desperately hard to keep on side with the member for Murray-Mallee following his revelations in the House earlier this year. Just as he will not be walking alone, I will not be walking with him.

ANGOVE'S SCRUB

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): Can the Minister of Environment and Land Management inform the House of the action that has been taken to protect and conserve the critically important Angove's scrub in the Tea Tree Gully area? The Minister recently announced that the scrub would be purchased by the Government and protected as one of the most important pieces of vegetation in the metropolitan area. Can the Minister advise what conservation status is proposed for the park and what role is proposed in the ongoing management arrangements for the Friends of Angove group, which has been instrumental in achieving protection for the park?

The Hon. M.K. MAYES: I thank the member for Albert Park for his question. This is a prime piece of remnant native vegetation in the metropolitan area, probably the last piece we have, and the Government is committed to saving it. We are now the proud owners of that piece of land of 5.2

hectares, now commonly known as Angove's scrub. It is very important for the people who live in the vicinity of Angove's scrub and for all South Australians. We have been successful in negotiating with the Angove family and we thank them for their patience in the issue.

We have been able to purchase land from the parcel of 10.8 hectares which they put on the market. This takes into account the two main scrub areas which are the main vegetation areas and the old vineyard, an area which adjoins the two where we anticipate revegetation will take place.

The valuation placed on the 5.2 hectares of Angove's scrub is \$1.91 million. The area has a high density of plant species and provides an important habitat for a variety of wildlife, such as the echidna and many types of birds. Those members who live near there, and the community who see it because they are close to the area, enjoy the benefit of that scrub. This land will provide an environmental and recreational hub for the existing suburbs and those new suburbs that are created around it.

The Government is determined to develop the area with the local community. We proposed to involve the Friends of Angove's scrub as we do other organisations, in the development, along with local government, and our own departments will play a part as well. We have had support from the Commonwealth Government, and I thank it for its contribution of \$200 000, as I do all those people who have been involved in contributing towards the saving of this pristine and important piece of scrub in South Australia. I look forward to working with the community to see that it is protected for future generations to enjoy.

TONSLEY INTERCHANGE

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): Will the Premier confirm that the Government's repeated promises to build the Tonsley interchange are in doubt because of the uncertainty of Federal funding? The Government announced before the 1989 election that it would build a Tonsley interchange, and the Minister of Transport Development repeated the promise as recently as December last year, saying that \$17.1 million in funding would be committed for the bus-train interchange. However, I have been advised that this announcement was based on Federal funding for the project being provided through the urban-public transport program, which has been scrapped in this year's Federal budget.

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: The honourable member has already made a statement that has answered the question. It is no secret that the matter was contingent on Federal funding: that was said before the last election and last year as well. Notwithstanding that there may not be funds in this—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: We can go on to that if the honourable member wishes. There may not be funds in this year's Federal budget, but that is not to say that there will not be funds in a future Federal budget. So our promise remains: we are prepared to put State funding toward the support of the project contingent on Federal funding.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: That is not a new point, because it was said before the last State election. The Leader refers to the allegation of broken promises. I find it interesting indeed.

An honourable member: Read it!

The Hon. LYNN ARNOLD: Okay, I will. I refer to an article in the *Advertiser* headed 'Labor's broken promises'.

The article states that, of the more than 100 specific election promises made, 65 have been fulfilled; six have been changed or not fully implemented (in other words, circumstances changed, and naturally if one implemented them as they originally were they would not apply); and eight are currently being met. So, 79 of the 100 promises—four out of five—have been met, or in the circumstances have gone as far as one could go with them, and one out of five apparently has not been.

Any reasonable reporting would have seen the article headed 'Labor's good record at keeping promises: four out of five have been met and one out of five not.' I do not think that the Opposition would do too well to lay too much emphasis on this article, which is not a very good exercise in journalism at all.

HOUSING TRUST, AGED CARE

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Will the Minister of Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations call on his department for a report in respect of security measures in Housing Trust aged complexes? The problem in my constituency is that there have been a number of instances of theft, breaking and entering, and intimidation of old people in Housing Trust aged care complexes. The police have been informed, but some extra security measures would enable my constituents to live in far greater peace. In particular, last week in one incident in Ingle Farm an 80 year old infirm woman's home was broken into by two males, who terrorised her to the extent that she suffered a stroke.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am sure that all members share the concerns that the honourable member has expressed in those circumstances. The capacity of the Housing Trust to provide security to all our houses to the extent that tenants would desire is not practicable. The Housing Trust owns some 63 000 houses, many of which were built many years ago. Often, whilst there is not a substantial security need on many of those properties which are secure properties, the perceptions of the tenants are that additional security is required. Some of that comes about through valid cause for concern, but often it is created by the marketplace, which preys on the fears, particularly of the elderly, in order to market security devices and products. The Housing Trust is attending to these matters to the utmost of its capacity.

The trust provides a range of security measures for particularly the larger groupings of houses, many of which have elderly tenants. On many estates it has improved the lighting to provide security of an evening, and it has maintained landscaping to minimise the danger zones where bushes, shrubs and trees have grown, thereby creating a dangerous situation. It provides property security to doors and windows, and minimum standards have been established in this area. An enormous amount of work has been done within the capacity of the Housing Trust.

In addition, assistance is provided by the broader community to assist tenants, and rightly so. The Police Department does an enormous amount of work advising on strategies to minimise risk and on the installation of appropriate security measures, and the police in conjunction with the broader community are involved in the very effective Neighbourhood Watch programs, many of which include Housing Trust estates. Some local councils are assisting low income groups to improve the security of their properties and provide advice and other assistance through home help schemes and the like.

In respect of Codd Street, Para Hills, to which the honourable member referred in his question, I will be pleased to ask the Housing Trust to investigate the specific circumstances and concerns of tenants in that situation.

QUEEN VICTORIA HOSPITAL

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): Can the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services inform the House of all the financial and other details relating to the potential purchase of the Queen Victoria Hospital site by SGIC? The original cost of the amalgamation of the Adelaide Children's Hospital and the Queen Victoria Maternity Hospital was just under \$52 million, which was originally to be offset by the sale of the Queen Victoria Hospital site for about \$7 million.

The Hon. M.J. EVANS: SGIC has an option on part of the buildings there, but not on all the buildings. That contract has not yet expired. I will be pleased to provide the member with a detailed analysis of the available legal position on that building, but I do not think that any of that detracts in any way from the significant achievement of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, which members will now see rising on the landscape. It is a substantial and important contribution to the State's health services for women and children and I know that the House will support that project in every way possible. I shall certainly be pleased to provide further details to the honourable member of the exact legal position in relation to the former buildings.

MARIJUANA

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): My question is directed to the Minister representing the Attorney-General. Will the Minister take up with his colleague in another place problems associated with the marijuana legislation, in particular the adequacy of present legislative limits about the number of plants and quantities of marijuana before heavier penalties apply? Police have made me aware that at present up to 10 plants usually involves only infringement notices, despite the value of such plants once matured. Police have also informed me that people are being approached to grow one, two or three plants for fees of \$1 000 or more. When such plants reach maturity they are worth many times that figure and infringement notices represent only a small fraction of the potential profit.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr QUIRKE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I would like that comment retracted. I have never argued in this House for that at all and the member for Hayward is his usual grubby self.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford has requested retraction of a remark.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, I spoke about 'your Government', not the honourable member concerned.

The SPEAKER: The Chair did not hear the remark.

Mr QUIRKE: If it had been anyone other than the member for Hayward, I would have persisted.

The SPEAKER: The Minister.

The Hon. G.J. CRAFTER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Most certainly, I will take up this matter with my colleague in another place as well as with the Minister of Emergency Services. It seems that the concerns the honourable member

is expressing come from officers of the Police Force and it is important to ascertain what the formal concerns of the Police Department are in this area as would be conveyed in normal circumstances to the Government through the Commissioner of Police.

I must say that this is a complex area of the law for police officers to administer because it does require on-the-spot judgments and decisions to be taken, often in difficult circumstances, and for those reasons it is appropriate that the matter be reviewed.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The proposal before the Chair is that the House note grievances.

Mr QUIRKE (Playford): Today in Question Time I asked the Premier about the superannuation position of many people in South Australia. In fact, one case that has come to light in the past week or so involves a constituent of the Premier who spoke to both the Premier and me. The man concerned lives in Salisbury North. He did what was the socially desirable goal of putting away a few dollars for his retirement. In the late 1970s he took the view that he needed seriously to address the question of his retirement then some years into the future.

In fact, he did what many workers at that time found difficult to do: he took out a superannuation policy that was destined to mature about 20 years into the future. The benefits of that policy at the time were shown to him by the person who sold him the policy and they looked very generous. I have here a document indicating that, if this person stays with the policy, he will be looking at a 9.75 per cent increase per year on contributions. In fact, according to the figures he was given at the time of taking out the policy, it looked as if he would be in receipt of about \$150 000 or more by the time he was 58 years of age, which was about 19 years after he took out the policy.

Indeed, some of the figures on this document were circled and it was pointed out to him that, for instance, if through the 1980s a 12 per cent real value could be achieved per year in superannuation, the figure might be higher still than that forecast. About 12 years after he took out the policy with MLC, the constituent, Mr McFall, contacted the company and ascertained what the roll-over was because, after 12 years, he had to make some rearrangements in his superannuation requirements.

In fact, he was told that far from the figure that he anticipated, namely, a sum nudging \$100 000, he found that the surrender value at 6 August 1993 was \$25 482.34. He was also told that that was not the amount of money he would get because there was what was commonly known in the industry as a gatekeeper's fee involving the deduction of certain amounts on the roll-over or surrender of a policy. Mr McFall found that he was going to get \$20 725.38 and that almost \$5 000 of the \$25 000 was to be deducted as an entrance or exit fee.

His contributions for 1992-93 amounted to \$3 549.04, or \$147 a fortnight. That is a great deal of money. Indeed, it represents one of the major investments for this constituent and he had hoped that the policy would be such that after 12

years he would be able to get at least a few years of salary back upon the surrender value of the policy. As it happens, his annual income is well beyond what the surrender value of the policy really is. It is well beyond that. In fact, he would have been much better off had he played the share market; despite losing a good amount of his funds in 1987, he would still have picked up more than that by now. Had he taken up bank interest on this money, he would be looking at two or three times this figure because of the high interest rate regimes in the early and late 1980s.

My intention in raising this matter this afternoon is to alert many South Australians to look closely at superannuation policies and particularly to call upon the Federal Government—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mr BRINDAL (Hayward): For the benefits of South Australians, I wish to comment on the latest machinations within the Government benches. It was apparent to everyone in this Parliament last night that Government members were in a state of high tension. I am told that this tends to happen when Governments are in their death throes. It is happening within this Government more than most because it is crumbling and decaying around issues that it is unable to resolve, including the election date, the future of the former Premier (the member for Ross Smith), the position of the Minister of Primary Industries in the Cabinet, the prospect of at least five Ministers losing their seats and what their futures will be, and a Cabinet reshuffle, with the member for Elder again being bitterly disappointed that he continues to miss out.

However, last night new fuel for the tension was ignited. Its spark has been the position of the Hon. Trevor Crothers in another place. I say nothing about the particular reasons that have led the Hon. Mr Crothers to take two weeks leave of absence, other than to record my sincere sympathy for him. However, like cannibals sniffing around the carcass, this Government is now tearing at his political remains, wondering who can salvage what from the uncertainty of his future. I believe it is the majority view of members of the Government benches opposite that the Hon. Mr Crothers should vacate his seat. Unfortunately, they are already fighting over the spoils. The member for Torrens believes that he is entitled to the vacancy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: I should have said 'the member for Gilles'. Let me recall to the House what the member for Gilles has said on a previous occasion about his predicament of not having a seat in this House to contest at the election. On 9 February 1992, the member for Gilles said that sitting with Mr Groom as an independent was the favourite of several options open to him and 'if factional leaders thought Terry Groom and myself would go quietly after being dumped, then they are simply stupid bloody fools'. On 10 February 1992 the honourable member said:

It would be untenable to sit with the Labor Government after the Labor Party has told me they do not want me.

On 23 February he said:

I have given Mr Bannon until the end of the month and I would merely reiterate my position that if I do not get satisfaction then 1 March will be independence day for me.

That deadline passed without result, so on 19 March 1992 the member for Gilles said:

I am still very much a day-to-day proposition.

In June last year the honourable member said:

Time is a problem for me now, but I don't want to put a deadline on this.

Finally, on 15 August last year, the honourable member accepted a deal to give him a vacancy in another place. He said:

It will be a vacancy that occurs at or immediately after the election.

If the Government has its way, that vacancy will occur with the retirement of Mr Crothers. However, once again, the member for Gilles is to be duded. He believes that he is owed that vacancy, and he wants Mr Crothers to go just before the election so that he can step into the vacancy without causing a by-election in the seat of Gilles, which the Government would not win.

However, the member for Henley Beach has entered the reckoning. Having failed to win a ministry because the Premier wanted a coalition and having failed to win pre-selection for a safe seat in the Assembly, the member for Henley Beach is currently number five on Labor's Legislative Council ticket for the next election. In the current political climate, however, this is very much the jump seat. It is the seat that the Government does not expect to win. Accordingly, the member for Henley Beach has put in his bid for Mr Crothers' seat. The member for Henley Beach has more support than has the member for Gilles: he is to be rescued and the member for Gilles is to lose out once again.

This is the latest self-centred brawl which is convulsing this Government. But it is not the only one. This Government is not governing South Australia in the best interests of South Australians. It is already behaving like a Party resigned to a long period in opposition. We are witnessing a Jurassic Park, played out not on the silver screen but every day in front of us, for it is the death throes of dinosaurs intent only on their own preservation. Yet there is another brawl in the offing, and this one will be over the position of the present member for Ross Smith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park.

Mr HAMILTON (Albert Park): One thing that I have learnt since I have been in the Parliament is to refer to the old saying, 'He who laughs last laughs best.' It may well be that the member for Hayward will not be laughing. I do not know what seat he stands for, I do not know what seat he purports to represent, and I do not think he knows either. I think at the last pre-selection of the Liberal Party he offered himself for three seats. It is sad that we hear very little about his electorate when he, who supposedly represents his constituents, stands up in this place. I rarely deviate from my electorate, and that is important.

An honourable member: Port Pirie.

Mr HAMILTON: No, it is not Port Pirie, you fool; I come from Mount Gambier. I thought you would have known that. Given the problems that my colleague in the Upper House has, it is very sad when members opposite start attacking personalities and using someone's disabilities and the tragedies that have brought about his problem as a political football in this place. I think it is a damned disgrace.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON: Members opposite may laugh about it, but it is a sick joke. I had a lot more time for the member

for Hayward prior to his contribution today than I have now. I thought he was beyond that sort of garbage, beyond getting into the sewer, in order to attack someone. He said, 'I don't want to attack him,' but he has by inference in raising this matter in the House. I understand the politics—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Albert Park will resume his seat.

Mr BRINDAL: I strongly resent the remarks that have been made. What I said is on the record and I ask the honourable member to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult for the Chair to know what the honourable member wants withdrawn. There has been a fair contribution by the member for Albert Park.

Mr BRINDAL: The honourable member made a quite unwarranted and unfair allegation that I attacked the Hon. Mr Crothers. That is not true, and I ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I can only ask the member for Albert Park to withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON: Definitely not, Sir. I have been in this place long enough to know about the use of smart words and clichés to attack another person. I do not think that the Parliament wants to see that. I do not resort to those tactics, I never have, and I challenge anyone on the other side of the House to say that I have. My colleagues are answerable to their own electorates and the people of South Australia. I do not resort to that sort of tactic, and I abhor it. I do not care who raises that sort of issue.

The reality is that the Liberal Party certainly has problems. One only has to refer to an article by Alex Kennedy in the *City Messenger* of 18 August to appreciate the problems that they have. We all know that the member for Bragg, who is the spokesperson for the Liberal Party on industrial relations, will be dumped after the next State election, irrespective of the position that he may hold. I think that Alex Kennedy has been very perceptive in her articles during this year. I know that members opposite do not like it and I know that the member for Mitcham will not have a bar of it, but he has to cop it. They are like Paddy's dogs: they dish it out and take it.

Then we have the member for Newland who thinks that she is to be a Minister in a future Liberal Government, if there is one. I have news for her. When Joan Hall comes into this place, she may even pull the rug from underneath her. The reality is that members opposite think that they are without problems, but we know that they have problems amongst themselves. We only have to see the reshuffle that has taken place in the past 12 months in this place on the other side of the House to understand the problems that they have had. How many Leaders have they had in the past 12 months?

Mr Lewis: One.

Mr HAMILTON: Four. Then we have the shadow Ministers. They are shuffled all over the place. No-one seems to know, nor do they know, who they are representing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey.

The Hon. P.B. ARNOLD (Chaffey): For many years one of the major concerns of parents, school councils and teaching staff has been the safety of students arriving at and leaving schools. It needs only one irresponsible driver for there to be a serious injury or death of a student. However, schools have great difficulty in convincing the Department

of Road Transport of the need for school crossings. That is especially the case in relation to primary schools which have students from the age of five years.

This is highlighted by a letter that I have received from Janet Jones, the Secretary of the Waikerie Primary School Council. I draw the attention of the Minister of Education, Employment and Training and the Minister of Transport Development to the content of this letter which I think expresses the concerns of many parents, teaching staff and certainly members of the school council. In her letter she says:

I am writing to you on behalf of our school community expressing concern over our inability to be able to have any form of safety crossing installed at our school.

As you may be aware, Waikerie Primary School is surrounded by roads, all of which are considerably busy. Although we have contacted the Highways Department and our local council, we have been informed that we are not eligible for safety crossings, due to the fact that not enough vehicles pass our school on a daily basis.

We find this criterion unacceptable and are not prepared to see a child injured or have a fatality before something is done. We believe that existing legislation prevents some schools to, in fact, be excluded from having a crossing made available to them. We seek your help to have this legislation reviewed as we feel all schools should be provided with at least one safe area where children can arrive and depart from school.

Our school has recently purchased a set of Safety Salls to be used on a trial basis and to date the effect on traffic speed past the school has been dramatic. However, we would like to see permanent crossings in place and believe this is a Government responsibility. We would appreciate advice on any further avenues we could explore in our endeavour to ensure the safety of the children at our school.

As I said, the real concern is for the safety of very young students of five, six and seven years of age arriving at schools where there is no safe spot for them to alight from a vehicle and cross the road. The last thing on earth we want to see is a serious injury or the death of one of these young students. I do not know how the Minister puts a value on human life, particularly when that human life is a very young student in his or her early days of attending school. I would ask that both the Minister of Transport Development and the Minister of Education, Employment and Training give serious consideration not only to the situation that has arisen at Waikerie but for all schools across South Australia, and particularly in the case of primary schools where we are dealing with very young students.

Mr HOLLOWAY (Mitchell): The Federal budget's adverse impact on the wine industry in this State has quite rightly received a great deal of publicity in the past two weeks. The negative impact of the higher fuel prices on rural industry and the transport industry has also been widely reported.

In today's grievance debate I wish to criticise another of the Federal Government budget decisions, which is damaging not only to the health of many Australians but also to a substantial industry within my electorate. I refer to the decision of the Federal Government to withdraw the Medicare benefit for eye examinations. I shall read a letter I received from Mr Jim Warwood, General Manager of Englehardt Eyeware Pty Ltd, Edwardstown, as I believe it eloquently explains the objectionable implications of this Federal budget decision. The letter states:

I am writing to strongly urge you to take a stand against the Federal Government's apparent decision to withdraw the Medicare benefit for eye examinations as part of its budget to be presented today. As Australia's only remaining metal spectacle manufacturer and as an active member of the Better Vision Institute (BVI) and the

Optical Distributors and Manufacturers of Australia (ODMA), we are extremely concerned about the impact this decision will have on our industry—and more importantly the impact it will have on the eyes of Australia.

There is no doubt that times are tough. However, by axing eye examination benefits people will be less inclined to consult an optometrist or ophthalmologist because of the cost involved. This benefit is a vital area of health care and if allowed to be withdrawn can only lead to Australians ignoring eye problems and ultimately there will be a social cost as people continue to operate machinery, drive motor vehicles, play sport and work around the home with substandard vision.

In the UK the axing of eyecare benefits resulted in a 40 per cent downturn in eye testing. In New Zealand, per head of population, there are 20 per cent less visits to specialists for eye testing. It can be reasonably argued that Australians will also ignore the need for eyecare once this benefit is abolished.

Engelhardt Eyewear is a profitable, medium-sized company employing approximately 120 South Australians and despite the economic hardships we have been making strong export inroads and our work force has been growing.

As someone who is wearing spectacle frames manufactured by that company, I am well aware that it has been held up as a model for good industry practice within this State. Mr Warwood's letter continues:

However, this budget cut places our growth, along with the rest of our industry, in jeopardy. All our plans are now on hold. One reasonably senior staff appointment (currently an unemployed person) will have to be suspended and our hopes to offer many of our casual staff full-time employment will also be delayed until we can accurately assess the full impact of the Government's decision on our business.

In short, it seems that the Federal Government is turning its back on local industry growth and at the same time directly contributing to unemployment and placing at risk the health of Australians' eyes.

On a more personal note I have been wearing spectacles since I was eight years old. Over the years I have visited my optometrist every year to two years for a thorough examination but in the past couple of years I have been going more regularly. I was told at my last examination that it was fortunate I had been visiting so regularly for check-ups as it has just been detected that I am showing early signs of glaucoma—an eye disease which must be carefully monitored and which has developed in the short space of months, not years.

I believe the decision to axe the Medicare benefit for eye examinations will discourage regular eye screening and in the long term could have far greater ramifications for the health and well-being of Australians.

The social implications of this decision would, I am sure, concern all members of this House but the impact upon a successful export orientated South Australian business should also be regretted by all members. I call upon the Federal Government to review the decision it has made on this matter.

Mr SUCH (Fisher): In Question Time I asked the Minister of Education, Employment and Training a question about what is now the Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education, formerly TAFE, concerning plans by this Government to dispose of one of the State Bank's assets and foist it on that institute against the will of the institute. It is a most disgraceful and outrageous situation.

The institute does not want Chesser Building: it is totally unsuitable as an educational facility. What this Government is trying to do—and the Minister did not really answer my question—is bail out the State Bank rather than focus on the needs of education and training in South Australia.

If we are going to become the smart State, the clever country, we must have the best educational and training facilities, not second rate cast-offs supplied in an attempt to help the State Bank. The situation that has arisen is quite disgraceful.

The Government is treating the institute and its council like young children. The institutes, if they are to be recognised in the community as real alternatives to universities, as places of excellence in training, must be considered as having autonomy and treated in a mature, independent way. This Government, contrary to the wishes of that institute, is trying to get rid of the Chesser Building and dump it on that institute.

I have a copy of a letter to the Hon. Kym Beazley, the Federal Minister for Employment, Education and Training, from the President of the Institute Council, Ms Alison Raggatt, which states:

Dear Minister, re Adelaide Institute of Vocational Education and Training. As President of the above institute I wish to draw your attention to the proposal by the South Australian Government to take over the building known as Chesser House in Grenfell Street, Adelaide, for use by the Adelaide Institute instead of using the approved and available Federal funding to extend and renovate the Light Square campus.

The department, the council, the staff and the students view this proposal as extremely detrimental to the educational program. The original plan would provide additional teaching capacity and significantly improve student access to support services and learning resources. Conversely, the proposed new building has many contra indicating aspects which include—

- problems with occupational health and safety;
- occupation of a building designed for commercial use only;
- located in the central business district it presents many problems of access for students, particularly those attending evening classes;
- only four lifts with 16 person capacity to service 12 floors and approximately 1 200 students and staff plus other tenants;
- impossibility to evacuate the estimated 1 200-plus people via fire stairs during an emergency;
- inadequate toilet facilities;
- inability to use the extensive library at Light Square as it is about a 20 minute walk from the Chesser House complex;
- impact on the educational program of the institute;
- lack of access to library facilities, student services, electronic lecture theatres, electronic classrooms, cafeteria and late night carparking, pick up and drop off facilities for stores and supplies.
- loss of morale amongst both staff and students because of a feeling of isolation from the main campus facilities.

Additional Costs:

- impact on recurrent budget because of the duplication of all costs. A considerable amount of money has already been expended in preparing detailed plans (I understand about \$400 000) for extensions and renovations;
- duplication of running expenses (Council estimates that the additional recurrent expenditure will be of the order of \$1.2 million per annum);
- excessive fit-out costs when compared with the Light Square proposal (estimated to be in excess of \$8 million in addition to the \$19.7 million budgeted for stage 5 Light Square).

As the project is federally funded, I feel it is my duty to lodge the strongest objections to the SA Government's plan to downgrade training facilities for students of the Adelaide Institute by forcing a change in the already advanced plans to renovate and extend the Light Square campus.

The whole object for the Chesser House option is prompted by the State Government's desire to remove it from the State Bank's so-called 'bad bank debt' as it was a project funded by the State Bank and developed by a company called Pennant Holdings (a Western Australian company now in liquidation).

I ask that you investigate this matter for the Council of the Institute and I look forward to providing further information should you so desire.

So, the answer we had today goes nowhere towards reassuring the people at the institute of this Government's real intentions. What we had was a fudge and—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

STAMP DUTIES (REFINANCING OF LOANS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr LEWIS (Murray-Mallee) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Stamp Duties Act 1923. Read a first time.

Mr LEWIS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I point out that this measure addresses the twin problems caused the by dog in the manger attitude of the Government and the generally deceitful, profit-greedy interest rate fixing policies of the banks' senior management in this country, almost all of whom are located interstate, with the exception of the State Bank, which equally with the other banks is hungry for money. At present the cartel of those bankers operating in the Australian financial market is being manipulated by the Reserve Bank's Bernie Fraser in the reregulated banking industry. I say 'reregulated', because it is not deregulated as has been claimed by Keating, Kerin, Willis and Dawkins, successive Treasurers, since Keating himself said that he had deregulated the banking industry: he did not; he simply opened up the market and reregulated it.

The Reserve Bank has even greater power over money supply and interest rates under this current Government than it ever had during the two decades preceding that action taken by Keating, now our Prime Minister. Whilst banks create the impression in the mind of those members of the general public who do not have a mortgage that all is well in the money market and that interest rates have fallen to the levels that they advertise on their windows, in the press, on radio and on television, we know that is not so. You and I, Mr Speaker, know that, but the general public does not, and it is far from the truth.

Whilst interest rates for new loans and for first home buyers have fallen to as low as 6 per cent, this has not happened to rates for secured loans to farmers, secured loans to small businesses and secured loans to existing home buyers. Those rates vary from 9 up to 14 per cent in the general market and, in several instances of which I am aware, they are still at 17 and 18 per cent, which is about three times the lowest rate that has been advertised and which creates the mistaken impression in the minds of the general public that interest rates are all at that low figure of 6 per cent.

One might well ask, 'Why is it so?' The answer to that is quite simple. The people who have those existing loans secured by mortgage to the banks and finance houses have asked for their rates to be lowered, but those rates have not been reduced because the money market is so inelastic. The financial institutions know that they do not have to meet the market they are advertising for new loans and first home buyers, because there is a stamp duty penalty if the borrower attempts to discharge the mortgage as it presently exists to refinance the loan with another finance institution. Accordingly, that is the reason for my moving this measure, which I believe has the support of the majority of the members of this place. I know that it certainly has the support of a majority of Liberal members and the member for Flinders,

who, whilst he is not a member of our Party, is nonetheless committed to the same direction as we are.

The amendment proposed by this Bill does not deny the Government any revenue whatsoever. It does not include proprietary or public companies—bodies corporate of any kind—but is restricted to natural persons; people like you and me, Mr Speaker. The amount of the loan that is to be transferred from one lending house or bank to another must not exceed \$200 000. So, there cannot be general profiteering and convenience on the part of large business interests or people who can, albeit with some difficulty, meet their obligations and pay stamp duty on those transactions.

Furthermore, the measure includes a provision which will enable the Commissioner for Stamps to recover the cost of the computer documentation of the transaction; that is, the discharge from one bank to transfer to another. Once we enact this legislation its effect will be to chasten the banks and the money market, not with any big stick, but with the necessity to recognise that they will lose business if they do not provide reasonable interest rates on their existing loaned assets, their existing lending to borrowers secured by mortgage. They will immediately bring their rates down and meet the market. It will break the cartel that currently exists and it will most certainly stop some business which is presently going out of this State to finance lending where stamp duty rates are lower.

You are mad if you borrow from a bank and register the mortgage on a home loan in this State. If you can possibly avoid that, you should borrow interstate and pay the stamp duty interstate, and there are means of doing that. Lawyers and other people in the finance industry will charge \$150 to \$200, and it will give you a much lower stamp duty rate on that loan. That is an aside. The most important thing is that, by introducing this legislation, the banks will immediately respond by making their interest rates more competitive and honest in relation to what they advertise for all borrowers—not just new loans and first home buyers. I therefore explain the very simple clause that amends section 81(d) of the principal Act. The proposed new section 81(d) provides:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, where on application made after the commencement of this section in a manner and form determined by the Commissioner, and supported by such evidence as the Commissioner may require, the Commissioner is satisfied. . .

Then there are four conditions that have to be satisfied. The first is that the mortgage is over real property, which means land and buildings attaching to it provides for the re-financing of a loan secured by a previous mortgage—the one you are trying to get out of, where the interest rate is too high—whether or not with the same mortgagee, which is being discharged. The second condition is that both the mortgage and the previous mortgage—the one you have just got out of—apply to the same or substantially the same real property. The third condition is that the amount of the loan secured by the mortgage does not exceed \$200 000, which is a very modest sum. The fourth condition is that the mortgagor is a natural person. The amount of duty that is to be payable is \$10, simply to meet the cost of rearranging the records kept by the Commissioner of Stamps.

The only minor point that might need some explanation is the legal meaning of the word to be found in the second condition of the proposed new clause; that is, the word 'substantially'. We say that both the mortgage and the previous mortgage apply to the same or 'substantially' the same real property. When the mortgage was first established,

the house on the land may not have had a pergola, there may not have been a bricked up barbecue in the backyard, and there may not have been a concrete floor in the garage 10 years ago or whenever and, because that has occurred in the interim, since the mortgage was first taken out, and now when the new mortgage is obtained those new items and details of the real property assets have been improved or changed somewhat—but nonetheless adhering to the same title of land, or the same title where a piece has been excised by compulsory acquisition for road widening perhaps, or some such thing—but the real property is substantially the same; and therefore the natural person with a loan not exceeding \$200 000 will be able to re-finance and register it, paying a duty of only \$10.

I believe that this will provide great relief to many home buyers who are presently still being held to ransom, because they cannot afford to meet the cost of the stamp duty for the transfer. It does not pay them to try to make the transfer. The stamp duty would be too great against the savings of 2 or 3 per cent that they would get for the next year or so on their loan—in some cases perhaps 4 per cent—and it does not pay them to make that transfer. Secondly, in the case of a small family farm with a loan of \$200 000, where again the owner cannot find the ready cash to do it, or the small businesses secured by loans on their premises, transactions are not occurring and the banks are reaping the benefit of the high interest rates they are charging. In those circumstances the Government is not getting any stamp duty because the transfers are not occurring. I believe that, in the name of compassion and fairness for the little people of this country, all members ought to give this measure support and swift passage.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

GOVERNMENT'S PERFORMANCE

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for its abysmal record of financial mismanagement, record unemployment, deterioration of essential services and broken promises, and urges the people of South Australia to vent their anger on the Government through the ballot box at the next State election.

It is coincidental that today the *Advertiser* should run as its lead story the headline 'Labor's Broken Promises'. It was interesting that in Question Time today we heard the Premier try to belittle the article by selectively quoting from it, and conveniently missing out the fact that just over 20 of the promises have been broken—very convenient. I interjected several times, even though I was out of order in doing it, Sir—and I recognise that—but I do not like to see selective quoting occur in this House, and that is exactly what happened today.

The Premier is obviously embarrassed at the record of his Government, and so he should be, because this Government needs to be condemned for its abysmal record. There is no doubt that South Australia lags behind the rest of Australia. That is a tragedy, when we think that South Australia was becoming the central State under the former Tonkin Liberal Government, and how advanced that thinking was, only to be cut off in its infancy by the Bannon Government, followed by the Arnold Government. South Australians have lost the freedom to grow in a personal sense through reduced employment opportunities, and how we are seeing that with our young people today particularly, through a lower quality of education—and we hear the Minister trying to defend the

Government's education policy almost daily, and trying to heap some questions over the Opposition's policies. Education opportunities will certainly improve under the Liberals. We have also lost opportunities through cutbacks to other essential services such as health, community safety, and passenger transport.

The member for Custance, the member for Murray-Mallee and probably all rural members know how our health services have been hit so hard by this Government. In my own electorate, the Minlaton hospital no longer is a hospital in the true sense of the word: acute services have gone. In the electorate of the member for Custance, the Blyth hospital has been closed—a tragedy. I could go through other hospitals and indicate how the finances and resources have been cut by this Government, yet members opposite have the cheek to stand here and say they are advancing the cause of health.

An honourable member: The member for Stuart wouldn't say anything.

Mr MEIER: She would not want to, because it is an embarrassment to her as well. The cost of Government to South Australians through taxes and charges has risen rapidly. At the same time, we have lost confidence in the ability of the Government to govern in the best interests of all South Australians. This loss of confidence is symbolised by the massive and preventable losses of the State Bank and other Government financial institutions. There is also the failure of the Government to ensure that major development projects proceed to create jobs, and the exodus of company head offices, manufacturing facilities and jobs to other States, and the belief of more and more young South Australians that their home State does not offer them a future. Unfortunately, we have seen so many graduates having to go interstate and overseas to get jobs.

An honourable member: Singapore.

Mr MEIER: Singapore has taken so many of our graduates, not because they want to go there but because there are no opportunities here. One only has to speak to young people to realise how hard it is, although the not so young—those in their forties and fifties—find it just as hard. There is no doubt that the Government has become remote from the people and is out of touch with their needs and aspirations and, worse, it is unwilling to account for Government actions that have let us down. We hear that in this House daily: Ministers not seeking to apologise for mistakes but repeatedly trying to bluff their way through. Labor's dreams are now becoming South Australia's nightmares.

It is not just me as the member for Goyder saying these things. I refer to the well known economic study by Arthur D. Little. This has been said before but it bears repeating. The Labor Government over the past 10 years has not seen the need to implement an industrial policy that fundamentally addresses economic restructuring. By and large, the policy has been one of 'shooting any bird that flies past' rather than planning for the future economic well being of the State. What a tragedy! We can see it so clearly.

Today, we heard the Minister of Business and Regional Development going off at the Opposition about its attitude towards the submarines. The Opposition has supported the submarine project fully, but we have tried to highlight that the Government should not hang its hat on one project alone. The Government seems quite happy to say, 'We have built a submarine and we will build another one.' Excellent! Full compliments! No problems! But how does that compare with Roxby Downs and the many other economic projects that have made this State? How does it compare with the tens of

head offices of businesses that have shifted interstate and the hundreds of businesses that have shifted interstate? That is a tragedy! Sure, we need many submarine projects.

Likewise with the Grand Prix: whose brain child was it? We all know that it was the brain child of the former Liberal Government. David Tonkin told me the minute I came into this place, and I came in as David Tonkin left office. Likewise, Michael Wilson, the then Minister of Transport, told me the same thing. This Government has sought to take credit for it from the word 'go'. Likewise, we can look at the assessment of the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies at the University of Adelaide. The report that it produced indicates that over the past 10 years the financial performance of South Australia was a wasted decade that has left South Australia as a fiscal basketcase. What an indictment on this Government! The centre says that the Government has failed to have any clearly enunciated economic development strategy: another massive indictment on Premier Arnold, who has been the Minister responsible for economic development since 1985. That is eight years—a phenomenal period.

Other key conclusions in that report are that South Australia's population growth has lagged behind every State except Tasmania; in employment growth, South Australia's performance has been inferior to the other States, consigning the State to high unemployment for the rest of the decade. Labour oncosts in South Australia are higher than every State except New South Wales. State taxation and spending have risen at a faster rate than in any other State, and the public debt position has become precarious. Retail sales remain dismal. The Government has failed to show any leadership in the economic reform process. These things are said by the Centre for Economic Studies in South Australia, an independent economic think tank. That is an indictment on the Government.

What are some of the examples of Labor's economic damage? It is unforgivable that South Australia's economic potential has been jeopardised by a legacy of the highest prolonged levels of unemployment since the great depression of 60 years ago. South Australia has attracted only 6 per cent of the nation's capital investment, thereby restricting our capacity to produce more goods and services and increased job opportunities. School leavers, as I alluded to a little earlier, face long periods of unemployment, with some never having the opportunity to obtain work, and those wanting to follow further education options being frozen out of opportunities. We hear of many examples of that, particularly at the beginning of each new year. Middle aged and older workers are losing their jobs, with little or no hope of again being employed. Households and families face declining living standards as real incomes fall and Government taxes and charges rise.

There have been record levels of small business bankruptcies as Government charges increase at the same time as domestic markets, and hence business incomes are declining. Yet the Government does not seem to be able to see that its taxes and charges have a habit of going up by much more than the CPI. Whose income has gone up in line with the CPI? Whose profits have gone up with the CPI? Virtually none's. Yet the Government insists on putting taxes and charges up by at least the CPI, and in so many cases by a cost recovery method, which means a lot more than the CPI.

Labor's economic damage is also seen through falling intrastate tourism and a reduced share of interstate and international tourism. It is seen through inaction that compro-

mises our reputation as the premier arts capital of Australia and the economic opportunities that that reputation gives us. It is seen through the loss of business head offices contributing to a serious brain drain from South Australia and declining influence over key investment and other company decisions.

We can think of major projects promised by Labor before the 1989 election that have failed to get off the ground. Some of them are mentioned in the *Advertiser* today: the Glenelg foreshore development, the Tandanya development on Kangaroo Island, the Wilpena development, the Mount Lofty development, the Marineland redevelopment, the Marino Rocks marina, a paper recycling plant, the Victoria Square facelift, including the demolition of police headquarters, a tunnel for the O-Bahn under the parklands, an O-Bahn for the southern suburbs, a third arterial road to the southern suburbs, and a major expansion of the Art Gallery. In total, these promises would have amounted to spending of more than \$1 270 million, and they would have generated thousands of jobs.

It is fascinating to see what people's attitudes and opinions are towards the Government. We have seen many interesting headlines, such as on 8 July when an article was headed 'Arnold leadership blow: factions win in row over Groom future.' Here we saw that the Premier could not even stand up for his own Minister, who is left out in the cold. It was not surprising that the Minister of Primary Industries said that he vowed not to try to bring down the Government but slammed the ALP factions as a curse on the Labor Party. And he is 100 per cent right. It is the internal faction fighting that has caused more trouble for South Australia than the average person recognises. We saw the headline 'South Australia like South Africa: Arnold in race storm' and that 1 June article this year stated:

In a scathing attack on the Government and its land rights record the former head of the Pitjantjatjara Land Council, Mr Yami Lester, said the Government had failed to support indigenous people. He said the Government's record was 'like for South Africa'.

I compliment Mr Lester, who recognises that the Government has had an abysmal record on race relations. However, it is not only Aboriginal people criticising the Government, because we heard one of the former Ministers, none other than Peter Duncan, slam the Bannon era. The report states:

... Peter Duncan, had launched a scathing public attack on former Premier Mr John Bannon, claiming South Australians would rue the day they heard Mr Bannon's name. Mr Duncan said history would see Mr Bannon and the former Managing Director of the State Bank, Mr Tim Marcus Clark, as the 'demolishers' of South Australia. The people of South Australia are seeing it exactly in that way. Likewise, when we saw the new team come in with Arnoldspeak and all that, we had the new Deputy Premier, Mr Blevins, saying that some South Australian employers are 'too stupid to cross the road'. What a tragedy for South Australia. Mr Blevins stated:

None of our employers are geniuses, I can tell you—far from it. They are too stupid to cross the road, some of them.

That is what this Government thinks of employers. If the Government ever says that it is thinking of small business, let us remind it of these comments. We then had the real indictment of this Premier when he supported Prime Minister Keating throughout the March Federal election campaign, yet on 3 July 1993 the Premier had the hide to say to Keating, 'Abandon your tax cuts.' He then called on the Federal Government to abandon its key election promises of delivering income tax cuts rather than slash funding to the States. What can we believe about our Premier if he makes the Prime Minister break his promises just a few months after the

election? Obviously the Premier will break any promise that he gives at the next State election.

Certainly, it is time for an election; it is time that the people of South Australia had a chance to vent their anger on this Government, a Government that has failed them abysmally in every area that one cares to examine—in every area that concerns the people, be they the little people, the middle people or the upper people in this State. They have all lost under Labor and they have lost tragically.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

GROUP ASSET MANAGEMENT DIVISION

Mr S.J. BAKER (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

I move:

That this House questions whether the State Bank or the Group Asset Management Division (bad bank) are being operated in the best interests of taxpayers and businesses.

Last night I alluded to the problems that I foresaw concerning how the State Bank is operating. It is not operating in the best interests of South Australians. I want to bring before the House a number of cases. They are not all the cases of which I am aware but they are a small sample of some of the difficulties being placed on small businesses, individuals and larger businesses by the State Bank. It is appropriate to talk about this issue because another farmer has been evicted from his property today, and I will discuss that matter briefly because it is of such great concern.

Last night I mentioned the pre-emptive strike by the State Bank involving one of its good customers, a customer who has significant assets and a small loan, but I will cite exactly what the State Bank did in these circumstances. Dated 19 July 1993 and addressed to a furniture manufacturing company, a letter stated:

Under instruction from our head office we are to undertake a full review of your facilities by 31 October 1993 in lieu of January 1994—

in other words, three months early—

This is to enable us to review your facilities and performance upon the receipt of your full financial year data to the end of June 1993. State Bank recently conducted an interim review using financials to 31 March 1993. Whilst there is some evidence of improvement in the company trading position, until your final financial year results are known, there remains a continuing concern over recent losses.

Those losses were in the previous financial year. The letter continues:

Interest margins reflect the level of risk associated with any advances to a client. Until such time as your financial performance can be assessed, an interest margin of 2.5 per cent per annum is to be applied to your facilities. That margin will be subject to reassessment at the same time that the review referred to is undertaken.

This person has not missed one payment to the bank and the bank is covered by more than adequate assets, but it has said, 'We want more money out of you. We want a 2.5 per cent risk margin applied to your loan. We want it done early, straight away.' It is a breach of the agreement, yet this manufacturer is one of the people that South Australia depends on. He is a small business person who exports interstate and he is a person highly regarded in this State. Of course, he is now going to another financial institution because the State Bank broke the rules and treated him like a leper. He has an exceptionally good business.

I wish now to cite another case involving the construction of a food mart, which involved a loan of about \$800 000. The bank signed up for interest only loans on a 12 monthly review basis for five years. At that time, in December 1990, it took

as an asset the construction of the food market itself. Trading commenced in December 1991 and in March/April 1992 the bank said, 'The liabilities exceed the assets.' In other words, the loan was worth more than the piece of property. The bank then demanded an extension to the asset base, extra security and additional payments. In fact, it went so far as to demand the title to the person's father's home. The bank demanded a take-up of a further \$100 000 as top up security against the home and further security against another property.

In December 1992 another review resulted in another \$25 000 being paid off the loan and the bank recommended that one of the properties be sold. In February 1993 this person sold his property at West Lakes and the bank took all the money and left his family without a home. The bank said, 'We need to have the money to ensure that you are capable of paying the loan.' That happened even though the original loan was secured over the food market. In March 1993 the family sold the Stirling property, the net outstanding at that stage being about \$430 000.

This person was forced to sell his home and his other properties. Of course, the food market is highly successful and the people concerned have taken out a loan with another financial institution that was more than willing to accept the potential losses involved, because there are none, yet this case involves a person whose family life was wrecked for about six months whilst the State Bank refused to give them any money from the sale of their house in West Lakes. I believe that that is unconscionable, as would most members of the House. This case involves a good customer, a person who has a thriving business, but he is happy to be out of the State Bank and away from the decisions that are being made.

I now bring to the attention of the House the matter of concessional home loans and the HomeStart scheme. When the Government announced the scheme, which would be operating under Federal guidelines, all those associated with the scheme were assured that there would be a 25 per cent income cap, which meant that 25 per cent of their income was the maximum that would be required to meet housing loan payments as the concession decreased. That means that they start on perhaps 5 per cent and move up to about 9.5 per cent, but there is a cap to ensure that people can afford it.

Of course, the State Bank has applied a few special rules, and I should like to talk about them. It has applied a savings limit of \$2 000, which means that one cannot have any money in the bank in case the car breaks down. It has said that people cannot have any additional borrowings, even of the smallest amount. People cannot have the concessional loan if their voluntary repayments exceed \$2 000. Finally, there cannot be an increase in the number of exemptions granted. Again, special rules apply to break the backs of small people.

I now take up the case of the Nicholsons. They have had a very difficult history with the bank and I am not in a position to judge the merits of their case, but something is quite compelling about the situation that they have faced. The State Bank, well aware that this was a non-performing loan, put pressure on the Nicholsons to come up with money—to extend the assets over which the State Bank could take money from everything that the family owned, including the family home. I have told people not to agree to anything like that unless they have guarantees from the State Bank. As soon as the asset, which could be called upon, was increased to include every asset of the family, the State Bank moved in and said, 'Now we want you to sell everything.'

In the process, the Nicholsons believed that they had a viable business with their real estate franchise, which was

earning good money and was profitable. The State Bank moved in, took all the furniture and equipment and sent the firm out of business. They got no money for the asset, except perhaps a few hundred dollars for the furniture. The capacity of the Nicholsons to repay the loan, which was the only good earning part of their business, was destroyed. They had no capacity to repay the loan.

More than that, in conjunction with the real estate business, the Nicholsons believed that they had the capacity to meet the payments if they could get some structural assistance from the RFDD. That was all put in place. Today the State Bank's appointee marched to the property with about 50 policemen to ensure that there was no violence on the site. Yet these matters could have been resolved easily if only a bit of sanity had prevailed.

I am aware of another financial institution which is making every attempt to allow farmers to quit their properties with dignity. It is saying, 'There is no good purpose in our spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in legal costs when we know you have not got the capacity to repay.' Indeed, they are assisting them off their farms. Not only are they forgiving the remainder of the loan but also they are giving them a small amount of money to assist them to leave the property. They are a mile in front. We have heard of court cases involving hundreds of thousands of dollars because the State Bank has simply been bloody minded. It does not know how to negotiate. The strings are being pulled by people who do not have the first idea how businesses operate in this State.

I do not believe that the Nicholsons have done everything right, but they have a few rights in this State and they have been treated very poorly. However, in order to get further information I have to get clearance from them. I now have that clearance and, even though it is after the event, I shall continue to pursue the matter and find out what went wrong.

Another case relates to the Longbottoms and a property at Robe. That is a tragic case. It was a viable yabby farming business called the Telegraph Yabby Farm. The State Bank offered sufficient finance for the farm to operate. When the project was halfway through, the bank withdrew finance, so the business could not succeed. I do not propose to relate all the details, because a number of other serious matters have yet to be debated during private members' time. However, I ask any member who wishes to look at this document to read it. It is quite horrifying.

The State Bank pulled the rug out from under the Longbottoms. More than that, having destroyed their future, it is now refusing to release the Longbottoms. The Longbottoms cannot get a resettlement grant; they are living in leased accommodation; they are in receipt of social security benefits because they do not have any money; and the last communication that I received from the bank was, 'We intend to pursue the Longbottoms to the ends of the earth and we do not care at what cost.'

This is the quality of administration that we have within the State Bank. Of course, they will have their own answers. They will say that perhaps some of these people did not assist the process. When people's lives are on the line, when everything they have worked for over the years is at risk, they will fight. But cool heads can prevail. We can offer these people a way to change their situation with dignity. However, that appears to be the last thing on the agenda of the State Bank. I could cite a number of other cases, but I will take them up at another time.

Mr HOLLOWAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MITCHAM HILLS ROADS

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That in the opinion of this House an improved road system must be created in the Mitcham Hills including upgrading of Old Belair Road.

I move this motion being fully aware of all the frustrations that motorists are having in the Hills as they attempt to come back to the city plains for work or whatever their journey may entail. I am also aware that funds are limited within our State structure. However, as a representative of that area, I have to raise these concerns on every opportunity that I have in this Parliament.

In talking about upgrading Old Belair Road, I am not advocating a top class road. If we did that, we would have an argument from those who drive heavy buses and trucks that they should also use that road. While it remains a restricted road as to the size of vehicles that may travel upon it, that is a benefit to commuters. The bigger operators are aggrieved because it is a steep road and the long way around, via Windy Point, although not as steep, is not a good road because it is quite narrow.

What I advocate for Old Belair Road is that from James Road down we should make another two lanes, even if we have to go through the old quarry immediately south-west of the pumping station. We would then have two lanes down and two up. We could make the James Road top end one way up and the top end of Old Belair Road one way down. I believe that that will have to be done eventually, and the sooner the better.

The traffic from the south through the Mitcham Hills is becoming a problem. It is one of the major concerns of people when they speak of the fear of the 79 hectare development of Craighburn Farm. They are concerned that, with more traffic coming from about 600 homes, instead of having a 5km or 6km queue in the morning, it will be 7km or 8km. That is not the only concern of those who are fighting to save Craighburn; another concern is environmental, particularly for those who live nearby.

We have to find a way of taking the traffic out of the Blackwood main street, not just because it is a main street but because it involves two railway crossings and a roundabout where five roads meet with no electronic traffic signals.

One proposal I have advanced in the past is that over a period of years the Government could buy homes which become available on the eastern side of the railway line, from Davey Reserve through to Rosella Avenue, where it joins the main road. When the Government had acquired all the properties which people had freely sold it could then build a road on the eastern side of the railway line. That would then take all through traffic out of the main street of Blackwood; it would eliminate traffic being held up at the Glenalta railway crossing; it would eliminate the need for the Blackwood railway station crossing; and it would result in eliminating one road at the roundabout at the junction of Coromandel Parade, Shepherds Hill Road, Main Road and Station Avenue.

That is one long term option. The authorities have to find a way around the town settlement altogether, but that is virtually impossible unless we are talking about a figure possibly somewhere between \$50 million and \$100 million. We would have to bridge across two very steep valleys. If we concentrated on the side near the Belair Recreation Park we would have a major road coming through that area causing environmental concern to the park and the residents in that

area. Even if we do those things we then have the task of perhaps encouraging more people to travel through the Mitcham hills, avoiding South Road and the other roads on the plains, and then dumping the traffic at Torrens Park and Fullarton. It would be like pouring water into a funnel. You can only pour in as much water as will run out of the bottom. We would have a pile up of traffic where the plains begin, at the bottom of the Hills.

I do not argue that it is a simple solution. The only hope I have of making it a little easier will be that in not too many years to come people will be carrying out their duties at home, using computers, etc., and will not be travelling to work; or there will be offices of big companies in the suburbs, such as Blackwood and other places, where people can work without having to travel to the plains as they do in the main at the moment. We will also find that deliveries will be made straight to the home because the cost of rent and other costs associated with operating big stores will not be able to compete with direct deliveries to people's homes. That is already happening overseas. Those things might decrease the amount of traffic on our roads.

So, I make the plea to the Government to tell us what its future planning is for the roads of Mitcham hills. It is urgent that some work be done. One idea I might mention, which is not directly related to the road itself but which would have an effect, is to put the Glenalta railway station on the up track from the city. If we shifted that station to the other side of the road junction, motorists would not have to wait while passengers got on or off the train. It seems stupid that for years we have had a pile up of virtually kilometres of cars waiting to cross while people are getting on or off a train, when the train could be at the other side of the crossing.

I have at least made a plea for the Government to consider improving traffic flow through the Mitcham Hills. There is much more I could say about individual roads, but I will not do that: I will merely ask the Government to take note of the concern of residents and the motorists who travel through the Mitcham Hills. There needs to be upgrading of the road surfaces in that area. I ask members to support the motion, which I commend to the House.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

SPEED CAMERAS

Mr GUNN (Eyre): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the South Australian police should adopt a similar code of practice for the operation and use of speed cameras as those which apply in New South Wales.

In moving this motion I remind the House that the operation of speed cameras and the number of on-the-spot fines being issued has been a matter of considerable controversy. It is clear that the argument of those people who hold the view that this is a revenue measure has a great deal of weight. The matter was brought to the public's attention on Thursday 10 June 1993 in an editorial in the *Advertiser* headed, 'Candid cameras are visible police cameras', and stating:

Government, police and public in New South Wales are trying to come to terms with the problem only too familiar here. What is honest enforcement of speed laws? What is revenue raising? Mr Peter Steele, a senior official of NRMA, equivalent to our RAA, put it in a nutshell: 'The biggest challenge is to make excessive speeding socially as unacceptable as drink driving. This cannot occur if the public is cynical about cameras being used for revenue raising and these guidelines should help reduce that cynicism.'

The guidelines require cameras to be highly visible, used in conjunction with marked police cars and manned by uniformed police officers.

The editorial continues:

The *Advertiser* has no time for reckless drivers just as it has no time for drink drivers, unlicensed drivers, unsafe drivers or hoons who put the lives of the innocent at risk.

But whatever the police may say in public defence, there is a perception now amounting to a conviction among the general public that the cameras are used to raise money and that this takes at least equal priority with safety. The public view, expressed with private vehemence, is that police have a quota and must fill it. The Police Commissioner, Mr Hunt, is on record as denying this. The perception remains and it is damaging to the police on two grounds: first, they must dedicate people to a job which really is of only marginal concern in maintaining the public peace.

I want now to quote from the press release issued by the New South Wales Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Mr Terry Griffiths. I sought this information following that editorial. It is a lengthy press release, which goes into the various methods of determining location, and part of it states:

Speed camera use—standard operating procedures.

Speed cameras must always be operated in an ethical manner.

1. Speed cameras must not be used in any location or in a mode which would give rise to criticism that speed camera operation is only a means of raising revenue.

That is:

At the bottom of hills or concealed locations.

Speed cameras will be only used in designated 'black spots' at times when accidents are known to occur.

Police performing speed camera duties are to maintain a high visibility. All such duties to be performed in uniform and only marked police vehicles are to be used.

The operator is to be positioned at the radar speed camera during the operation to verify target speed.

The portable 'speed camera in use' signs to be:

clearly visible to motorists travelling in the direction being detected;

on the departure side approximately 50 metres from the camera;

in view of the operator.

2. Police performing speed camera duties are to ensure:

strict compliance with the AWA Vehicle Speed Radar and Camera Recorder Operation Manual;

set up and shut down procedures, including 'run through' are strictly observed;

log sheets are completed at the end of the operation, checked for errors, signed and faxed to the Infringement Processing Bureau at the termination of each shift;

that the recording of movements of film cassettes on the computerised system is completed.

The document goes on to outline speed camera use and details certain reasons for their operation. The documentation also contains a speed camera notice, which is clearly visible, and shows in certain locations large signs on the roadway similar to those used in South Australia indicating that we have random breath testing.

I believe that this code of practice or one similar to it should apply in South Australia. It is interesting to note the number of infringement notices that have been issued and the increase in the number. I have been informed that the overwhelming majority of them are as a direct result of these cameras. Having observed locations of these cameras, I suggest that certain locations do not comply with the requirements set out in the New South Wales guidelines.

I will give the House two examples. On a regular basis I turn off the Main North Road past Stillwell Ford and I find that a speed camera is located at the bottom of the hill at the edge of the parklands. When one is going up through the Mid North one finds another favourite location—and this is also at the end of a slope—just before one gets to Tarlee, where there are bushes on the left hand side of the road. It is another prime location.

Mr S.G. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr GUNN: I was indicating that there had been a substantial increase in the number of on-the-spot fines basically as a result of the introduction and use of speed cameras. In the Auditor-General's Report last year on page 131, dealing with the Police Department, it states:

Recurrent operations: Infringement notice system

The payment of on-the-spot fines allows offenders to expiate legal action for proclaimed offences under the Road Traffic Act and under the Controlled Substances Act. The increase in receipts from infringement notices of \$8.2 million to \$23 million is due principally to an increase in the number of notices issued from 111 500 to 315 500. Notices not expiated by the due date are forwarded for court action.

It will be very interesting to read this year's Auditor-General's Report to see what the increase has been this year. I believe that far too much emphasis has been placed on these sorts of operation whereas other areas of police action could have received extra resources. I am of the view that there is a need to increase the speed limit on some of the maximum highways—for example, the Stuart Highway—from 110 kilometres to 130 kilometres per hour. Anyone who has driven on that road will know that very few people travel at 110 kilometres per hour, a speed at which one seems to be standing still while other vehicles overtake. Modern cars are safer and the roads are better. In my judgment, people are not acting irresponsibly when driving at a speed of between 120 and 130 kilometres per hour at such locations.

I agree that where people act irresponsibly or dangerously the police have a responsibility to apprehend them to protect the public. Where people are annoying the community in such a way the police have my full support in dealing with them. However, this motion would bring South Australia into line with New South Wales. There is another problem in relation to over-zealousness of the current operation. In my judgment it is too easy to issue a ticket. I tried on an earlier occasion to have official cautions introduced, but this Government was not prepared to do that, and it put up the hapless member for Napier to defend its stance. The honourable member had difficulty reading the brief prepared by the police, but we understand that. Of course, he is not worried about that at the moment, and I hope he is enjoying the sunshine.

In my view, penalties being imposed on people are in many cases creating an unnecessary hardship. People get whacked with one of these fines when on certain occasions some of them would not even know that they have committed an offence. It is harsh and the law is being enforced in a harsh and unreasonable manner. That was never the intention of Parliament. All those people who have studied the legal situation in this State would say that it is wrong to have unreasonable laws enforced in a harsh or unreasonable manner.

If these procedures were instituted it would remove a great deal of public concern and anger, because there are many people who believe that this particular program is being implemented with far too much enthusiasm; it has been overdone, to put it mildly. I look forward to the actions of the next Liberal Government in relation to this matter. I will be referring to other matters in relation to the range of offences which can be expiated—and some of them are right over the top, in my judgment—in a motion in the coming weeks. I look forward to this matter being taken seriously, because it

is a matter of public concern, and I commend the motion to the House.

Mr McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

BASKETBALL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian Women's Under 21 Basketball Team on winning a gold medal in the recent World Youth Championships in Korea, and also congratulates South Australia's Adelaide Lightning player, Michelle Brogan, on winning the most valuable player award.

I am sure that all members of this House will join with me in applauding the efforts of the women's youth team in Korea. This is the first world gold medal for basketball that Australia has ever won, so it really is a major achievement. When you consider that there were 194 teams playing in the competition, and that world-wide there would be some 100 million basketball players, I think that you can see the merit in congratulating our team.

In the Australian team every State was represented, so it was truly a representative team. The members of the Australian team were Jenny Whittle, Michelle Brogan, who was our South Australian Adelaide Lightning player, Joanne Hill, Sally Crowe, Laura Howlett, Christy Harrower, Samantha Tomlinson, Gina Stephens, Carla Boyd, Maryanne Di Francesca and Michelle Chandler. These girls played an excellent championship. The group in which they competed comprised Poland, France, Taiwan, Brazil and China, and in the semi-final Australia played South Korea, and I believe that that was really quite a good match in terms of the play.

The skill levels of the Australian team really did surprise some of the major teams in the world championships, and it looks to me as though this under 21 team could well be the team that competes at the Olympics and wins a gold medal for Australia there, and again that would be a first for Australia. It is wonderful to think that we have a team that is the best in the world, and that the most valuable player in that team was our own South Australian, Michelle Brogan. I saw the final against Russia, and one of the problems that the Australian team came up against was a 205cm Russian forward who did a lot of rebounding under the basket, but nonetheless there was some very skilful play in edging that player out, and the rebounding capacity of the Australians was well and truly to the forefront, even considering the height of that particular Russian player.

I thought that it would be quite a close match, and that looked to be the case up until half-time, but after half-time it was very obvious that the skills of the Australian team were far and away better than those of Russia. Russia was in the same division as the United States. The two teams that were tipped to be in the final were the United States and Russia. However, they drew the same round so it was difficult for both teams. It could be considered unfortunate for the United States' team that it lost only one match and still could not make the finals. So, it was bad luck for the United States but, even so, I think that they would have found it very difficult to match the skills of the Australian team.

One of the reasons that I think we are now competing so aggressively and so well on the world scene in basketball is the National League, in which the States now have representative teams. This is a very similar situation to that which applies in the world of netball. Since we have had this National League the skills level, for both the men and the women, has improved markedly, and that is made obvious by this win. Our young players are our players of the future, but

we do have some very good senior players. As I said before, I think that this team will represent Australia at the Olympics. It is also very interesting to see that Adelaide Lightning, the team in which Michelle Brogan competes, was at the top of the National League. I have to confess that I did not hear the results of last week's match but, for the two weeks that Brogan was away at the world championships in Korea, I know that the team was going to be a bit lost without her. Nonetheless, it does have some very strong players.

Another of those very strong players was Maryanne Di Francesca from Western Australia, who was also very strong under the basket and was able to compete with Michelle Brogan against the Russian girl, who was causing so much trouble in that final. All of the players showed marked shooting skills, but Michelle Brogan, Carla Boyd from Tasmania and Jenny Whittle from Victoria stood out in the matches that I saw and seemed to be doing a lot of the shooting for Australia and scoring a lot of the points.

I would also like to congratulate the coach of the team, who has done an excellent job. I believe that the team did a lot of its training at the institute in Canberra, and in fact a lot of the players were actually part of the AIS team. Since the AIS has been involved, the skills level of the Australian team has improved, and I think we can applaud the Federal Government's initiative for providing the funding for that. It is not only women's basketball that has improved through that area, but also the men's basketball team. I think we need more of these institutes to encourage our young people, and to foster them in their chosen sports.

These young people are ambassadors for Australia, and I believe that they were excellent ambassadors during their tour overseas. I know that South Korea had anticipated that they would have a good match against them in that semi-final, and in fact it was considered that South Korea would get the best of the Australian side, but that was not to be because the Australians played an excellent game. In the final the score was 72-54, so we can see that it was a meritorious win—

The Hon. D.J. Hopgood interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: As the member for Baudin says, it was a good victory. I know that all the players were very proud to be the first Australian recipients of a gold medal at world championship level, and indeed they should be very proud. I think that this State should be very proud on behalf of our players and of all the players who competed in a side with representatives from all the States of Australia. I have a great deal of pleasure in moving this motion, and I would urge all members to support our young sportspeople in the world of basketball. It is an opportunity to indicate to them that we are truly proud of them for their meritorious efforts.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): I am sure that the basketballers will understand the shortage of time we have this afternoon, but I think that it is important that this motion passes today. The Opposition, including the National Party member and the Liberals, understand the great benefits that accrue from our sporting people who go overseas, particularly when they win in such grand style. Our Parliament needs to remember that these young people are excellent sporting persons, most of whom gained their skills when our State still promoted interstate competition with school children. That is when they develop their skills and enthusiasm. That has been eliminated to a great extent in the past couple of years. As parliamentarians we need to be conscious of the benefits that can be gained. I say that out of personal interest because I have a grand-daughter who is in Perth this week playing in

the national titles at only 13 years of age. When she was younger, under the present system she would not have been allowed to compete.

Michelle Brogan and her family can be very proud, as can the whole South Australian community, the coaches, the sponsors, the supporters and in particular the players. This sport places a great deal of stress on the body, particularly the ankles and knees and especially in those who start at a young age. On behalf of the Opposition, I thank the member who raised the matter. We support what the honourable member has said, and we congratulate those involved in the Australian women's basketball team for winning the world title.

Mr BECKER (Hanson): As the member for Davenport mentioned, we are strictly limited to just a few minutes to speak to this motion, which congratulates and acknowledges the success of the Australian under 21 women's basketball team. My involvement with women's basketball goes back some 16 years when my daughter started to play. We are absolutely thrilled and delighted as a family and as supporters of the Noarlunga basketball club that Michelle Brogan, who plays with that club (and my daughter plays with Michelle), has done so well. Nobody has worked so hard over so many years or has made such a tremendous sacrifice to obtain not only State but national selection as Michelle. She is a wonderful ambassador for South Australia. She deserves all the accolades we give her, as do all the members of the team; but on this occasion it is Michelle who deserves a special mention for her outstanding performance during the world championships, thus proving that South Australian sports-women are equal to the best in the world.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I thank members on the other side for supporting this motion and for the comments that they have made. The member for Hanson raised something that is very relevant: the amount of time, effort and complete dedication and commitment shown by all these players. One does not get to be the best in the world without that dedication and commitment. These young players are to be applauded for showing that commitment. In doing so they miss out on many social functions and other things that young people enjoy doing. It is well worth it in the end when they can say, 'We are the best in the world.'

Motion carried.

MEALS ON WHEELS

Dr ARMITAGE (Adelaide): I move:

That this House—

(a) Notes with pleasure the decision of the National Meals on Wheels Association Incorporated to hold a National Meals on Wheels Day on 1 September 1993;

(b) Acknowledges the purpose of such a day is to bring to the attention of the general public the importance of the Meals on Wheels service to the aged, infirm and disabled;

(c) Encourages volunteers to contact their local Meals on Wheels branch, or the central office, to offer their services; and

(d) Congratulates all involved with Meals on Wheels in its nearly 40 years of services to South Australians.

As members of the House would know, Meals on Wheels was started by Doris Taylor, who was physically handicapped from the time she was nearly seven years old. For the nine years between seven and 16 she was in the Children's Hospital and in the Royal Adelaide Hospital almost continually with a spinal injury. At the time she turned 16 she was severely handicapped, being unable to turn her head, sit up or whatever.

During the depression, Miss Taylor organised schemes to raise money to provide clothes for the unemployed and

children whose parents were unemployed, and set up a kitchen in the local school grounds serving bread and homemade soup. The plan to provide people with a hot midday meal in their homes evolved in 1953. On 6 October 1953 a meeting of pensioners was held which gave clear endorsement to the plan. On 3 December a provisional committee was organised.

The then newspaper, the *News*, began a subscription list. The Mayor of Port Adelaide arranged for Doris Taylor to speak to his council, as a result of which a small block of land was given to the original Meals on Wheels. Then Le Messuriers, timber merchants in the area, donated a prefabricated hut for the first kitchen. On 9 August 1954 the first meals were served. I understand that the kitchen was sadly lacking in modern conveniences at that stage. Nevertheless, in true Meals on Wheels spirit people did not let lack of plumbing or anything get in the way of their dedicated desire to serve their fellow person. What began in a small way has evolved into this marvellous organisation. The original run of Meals on Wheels started with eight clients and 11 helpers.

As members would know, the main aim of Meals on Wheels is to provide meals for people who are unable to cope with preparing or cooking on their own, for whatever reason, usually age, and referrals are made by a doctor or other professional person who sees a need, and it goes from there. I happen to be a volunteer driver for the City of Adelaide, and I note that the member for Semaphore is also a volunteer driver for Meals on Wheels. I volunteered for the Adelaide branch. I am sure that the member for Semaphore would agree that it is really terrific to go to one of the Meals on Wheels local branches around 11 a.m., when the drivers arrive. It is a hive of industry. Five days a week volunteers arrive early in the morning to prepare the very nutritious meals. Then we go off with a little bag of soup and meals in the back of the car. Usually, we deliver to about 18 persons on each run. People pay \$17 a week for the service, and that goes towards preparing the meals.

At the moment, there are over 100 branches of Meals on Wheels in South Australia, but they lack many volunteer services. Hence the point of this motion. The Prospect Meals on Wheels branch, about which I have spoken in the House previously, advertised in the local press for volunteer helpers. It distressed me that, of the large number of people who offered their services, only one was not seeking payment. That is a sad indictment of society today. Meals on Wheels delivers 4 000 meals a day throughout South Australia, and more than 8 500 volunteer helpers are involved in preparing and delivering the meals.

Meals on Wheels delivers 4 000 meals a day throughout South Australia and more than 8 500 voluntary helpers are already involved in preparing and delivering meals. As I am sure the member for Semaphore would agree, a great variety of meals is served and I take my hat off to the people concerned for the organisational skills with which they are able to organise special dietary meals for people who are diabetic or who need other types of meals.

I note that Meals on Wheels is moving with the times and now consideration is given to the preparation of ethnic meals for more ethnically based areas and so on. When one looks at the variety of meals served by Meals on Wheels, one sees that there is not the greatest of need to be specifically ethnically based because there is such a wide variety anyway. I know that other members of the House agree with that view.

As well as the benefit of nutrition, I would like to draw to the attention of the House the enormous benefit to the community of having people, first, staying in their own homes and, secondly, being in their own homes and being visited on a regular basis. People who have been involved as volunteers know that it is a real social contact, even though the visit is fleeting and there is clearly an exchange of money on the Friday, which is when I do my deliveries.

There is never any suggestion of anything other than friendship between the people delivering the meals and the recipients. Indeed, one of the most cogent reasons why many of these people are able to stay in their own homes is that they are having social contact and nutritious meals. The two Meals on Wheels kitchens in the State electorate of Adelaide to which I would like to focus on briefly, recognising the time constraints, are the Adelaide kitchen, and I will speak briefly about that, which commenced serving meals on 22 June 1957, when it was opened by the then Lord Mayor, Mr J.S. Philips, and the Prospect kitchen, which was opened by the then Minister of Education, Mr Baden Pattinson on 2 March 1958.

However, I was distressed to note when talking about volunteers and so on that the effects of modern day taxation policies affect everyone and no more so than Meals on Wheels volunteers. I understand that the recently announced increase in petrol tax will cost Meals on Wheels volunteers around South Australia another \$18 000 to \$20 000 a year. That is the sort of thing that I am certain no Government wants to have as a legacy but, nevertheless, it is fact that the recent Federal budget will cost the volunteers, who are doing their best for their community, an extra \$18 000 collectively.

Mr Matthew: That is disgraceful.

Dr ARMITAGE: As the member for Bright says, that is disgraceful. As to the Adelaide branch, which is the branch I am privileged to work with, it operates from the Sturt Street kitchen and services the city and the area of my run, North Adelaide. It also services parts of Unley, Goodwood, Millswood, Forestville, Wayville, Mile End, Keswick and Ashford. We serve about 90 meals a day, five days a week with 25 to 30 volunteers serving their community and preparing and packaging meals. About 80 volunteers, as I said, deliver the meals from the Adelaide Meals on Wheels kitchen, and there are four routes.

In addition to rostered drivers, two Rotary clubs from the local area have becoming involved in supplying drivers and a business house is involved. As I said, unfortunately it is becoming increasingly difficult to recruit volunteers, hence National Meals Day, which is the subject of this motion, is an attempt to increase publicity and get more people involved. As you and other members would know, Mr Speaker, awards are prepared by Meals on Wheels central office for meritorious years of service ranging from three years and upwards to 35 years.

I am delighted to say that, over the past five years, volunteers from the Adelaide branch have received the following awards: one for 35 years of continuous service, five for 30 years of continuous service, four for 25 years of continuous service, nine for 20 years of continuous service, 10 for 15 years of continuous service, 8 for 12 years of continuous service, 27 for seven years continuous service and 39 for three years of continuous service. These awards are a wonderful example of people being willing to go out of their way to serve the less fortunate members of the community.

Naturally, not all the above recipients are still active, but three of the people who were recipients of awards for 30 years of service are still active, three of those who received

awards for 25 years are still active and all nine of those receiving awards for 20 years of volunteering still work with the Adelaide branch of Meals on Wheels. In particular, I take my hat off to the Adelaide branch's Con Bleeze and Sue Brabham, who organise me and the other volunteers with great humour each week. I would particularly pay credit to the person who goes out with me on my delivery run—on the occasions when I do it—a man called Bengt Ericsson, who has been unemployed for some years. He has been volunteering on a regular basis twice a week with Meals on Wheels for at least two years. I am impressed with the enormous affection he holds for the clients and I am distressed that someone who is so keenly involved in providing a service to other community members is unable to be employed himself.

I have discussed with Mr Ericsson the fact that I believe that there ought to be some credit given through the unemployment system for people who are consistent volunteers for community organisations so that they be given some credit or get interviews for other jobs and the like first. I am sure it would be to the benefit of the community organisations, because they would get more people who would be happy to work as volunteers. It would obviously be of benefit to the people who are doing the volunteering as well as the people who receive the service. Clearly, it would be to the benefit of the organisations that would employ these people because there is no question—and as a previous employer of people I know—that, if someone has been a volunteer on a regular basis, one is much more likely to employ them as they have made a voluntary contribution to society. That matter ought to be looked at. However, that is a little away from the National Meals on Wheels Day.

I commend the motion to the House. The House does not need any urging to support the Meals on Wheels Association because I know the value in which it is held by members, but I hope specifically that volunteers who may hear about this National Meals on Wheels Day will be rushing to a phone to contact their local branch or the central office to offer their services. I hope the House will join me in congratulating all the Meals on Wheels people who have been involved over the past 40 years.

Mr De LAINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOUSE PLAGUE

Mr BLACKER (Flinders): I move:

That this House calls on the Government to immediately declare the current mouse plague as a natural disaster and in so doing acknowledge that the problem is of a proportion beyond the capacity of individuals to absorb and therefore becomes a total community problem and, further, this House recommends that the cost of strychnine and the cost of Department of Primary Industries supervision be met by the taxpayer and that the cost of grain and the cost of the spreading of bait be borne by the grower.

It will be noted that the motion is rather lengthy, but it is designed to set out the basic thrust of what I am trying to call upon the Government to do on this occasion. Most members will be aware of the lead-up to the Government allowing the use of strychnine to control the mouse plague that has beset many areas of South Australia. I do not think that too many members fully understand or appreciate the gravity of that disaster, particularly for those who are in the thick of it. It was through no fault of theirs; they just happened to be geographically located in the area where the mouse plague was able to generate, and the reproduction of the mice in enormous numbers was such that basically it overcame everything and everyone in that area.

The Government, to its credit, allowed the use of strychnine. That was a controversial move which I believe required courage and it was handled very well. They were able to do that in a reasonably short space of time. I understand the politics of all that took place, and I certainly add my support and commendation for the way in which it was handled and the relative speed with which it was achieved. Some people say that it was three weeks late and it should have come earlier and various other comments like that. We can all say that, but the process of government is sometimes slow. In this instance, having some understanding of the difficulties in bringing something like this into being, I can recognise the results that have taken place.

The real problem now is whether the strychnine bait that has been used has been effective and, more particularly, has controlled the plague. We know that it is effective. In round terms, 90 per cent kill has been achieved in most instances. Of course, this is a costly exercise to undertake and I will relate some of those costs shortly. Some farmers have spent up to \$15 000 to control mice but, because the neighbours have not been able to spend money on bait, that property has been reinfested by mice from the neighbouring areas. Further, some farmers who are short of cash are unable to bait their whole farm so, wisely to one extent, they have baited the cropping ground in the hope that will enable them to get a return. At the same time, they have not been able to bait the pasture ground. We must bear in mind that the pasture ground was last year's stubble where there was storm damaged grain on the ground, and that was the breeding and feeding haven of the mice. In some areas it was counterproductive to bait the crop ground because that is where there were fewer mice and to leave unbaited the pasture land which, in turn, reinfested the crop land. It was a very vexed problem.

My motion is aimed at calling upon the Government to recognise this as being a community problem, not just of individual farmers. It is a community problem because this disaster can in no way be attributed to the farming practices of individual farmers or anyone else.

Where we go now is the real problem. Members may recall that the last mouse plague in 1982 or 1983 did not start until well into September. By the time it was recognised as being of plague proportions, mice were attacking the standing crops. They were climbing up the stem of the wheat plant, nipping it off at the node, and the losses were being incurred in that way. Furthermore, the mice were still in the crop at harvest time and some were being caught within the header. If they went through the thresher, of course, that fixed them. However, live mice were getting to the silos via the grain trucks. It meant that the cooperative bulk handling had to put a fine mesh across the grids of the silos to prevent mice from getting into them. One mouse in a 40 000 tonne shipment of grain will stop that ship. Our export market can be ruined by one mouse. Therefore, this is a crucial matter.

At present, farmers are assessing the value and effect of the baiting that has taken place. As I mentioned earlier, it has achieved a 90 per cent kill, and basically people are very happy with that. What has not been taken into account is the ongoing process. I am suggesting that the Government should make sure that blanket baiting of the entire area takes place. In all probability, that will have to be followed with another baiting three weeks or a month later because, although it is clear that the adult mice that were feeding were effectively taken out with the bait, the mice that were not taken out probably burrowed very deep. There is an unusual factor on

this occasion, because mice have been known to be burrowing at least four feet deep.

Mr Becker: Why is that?

Mr BLACKER: Nobody can understand whether they are chasing moisture. I know that on one occasion some young children at Poochera trickled a hose down one mouse hole and got 82 mice out. That is not an uncommon experience. I believe that people who have been digging pits have found mouse holes going down. It appears that they are going down, hitting the water table and then coming up again and creating a cell group within that. The Pest Plants Commission is somewhat baffled by some of the activities of the mice.

However, the real problem must be addressed on a wider community basis to ensure that we get those kills. It is pointless just thinning them out if the remainder are going to regenerate and become the disaster that occurred in 1982 when the mouse plague started in late September. We have in plague proportions now a nucleus breeding group that will breed and become a problem area for September, October, November and into the harvest period.

To give some indication of the costs involved, I asked one of my producers who knew of individuals to provide me with names, tonnages and costs. I will leave out the names. However, in terms of the tonnages of bait used, one farmer had 3 tonnes of bait for 2 800 hectares at a cost of \$9 000. Another chap had 4 x 200 litre drums costing \$1 800. Some 2.4 tonnes for 2 000 hectares cost \$7 200; 2.8 tonnes for 2 300 hectares cost \$8 400; 2.8 tonnes for 2 000 hectares cost \$6 250; and another gentleman had five tonnes of bait for 4 600 hectares and that cost \$15 000. The indication is that there were good results, but perimeter baiting was necessary against neighbours reseeding or reinfestation.

The Government is claiming that it has been good to farmers because they are putting out the bait much cheaper than the Victorian Government. My understanding is that the South Australian Government is charging \$3 a hectare for the bait, plus \$2.50 for spreading, which takes account of aerial spreading. Victorian costs are \$3.50 per hectare plus \$4.50 per hectare for spreading. In other words, the aerial baiting—allow me to use 'baiting' rather than 'spreading' because it gives the wrong connotation—is more expensive in Victoria. Basically the differential cost between the South Australian charge to the farmer of \$5.50 and the Victorian charge of \$8 is in effect only 50¢ per hectare as a result of the bait.

The other issue involved is that many people believe the Government is making money on this. My understanding is that the treated grain is distributed from the Minnipa Research Centre. The farmers supply the grain, and I understand that 47 tonnes has been treated at the Minnipa Research Centre at a cost of \$141 000.

To treat the grain requires three kilograms of strychnine per tonne, and the strychnine costs \$400 per kilogram, or \$1 200 per tonne, totalling \$56 400 for that 47 tonnes of treated grain. In addition, it is necessary to add a dye. We would all agree that nobody would want grain lying around which might contain the strychnine contaminant and which could not be easily identified. So, we would allow \$500 for dye in 47 tonne of grain.

The sugar and sodium bicarbonate, which makes the strychnine stick to the grain, costs \$1 175. I do not want to be ultra-conservative but let us allow a figure of, say, \$4 000 for safety gear for the operators. Then there is plant hire: the equipment used was actually farmers' augers and equipment, and we will allow a figure of \$5 000, although I venture to

suggest it would be nowhere near that. The freight component adds another \$1 000. For training of operators, one should include \$5 000, although I think none of us would believe it would be anywhere near that. Let us say that the cost of labour is \$15 000. I have been given a figure of \$10 000 but let us make it \$15 000.

That gives us a total of \$88 075 on the basis of the figures I have just related to the House. The Government has charged \$141 000, but the actual cost to the Government would appear to be little more than 50 per cent of the amount it has actually charged. That is the sort of thing that is making the farming community irate. In fact, it is seen by some—and I would hope this to be proved not the case—on the figures which I have related to the House, that the Government is actually making money on the bait it is supplying to farmers. Bearing in mind that the farmers supply the grain and do all the spreading, members may realise the import of this motion, seeking that the Government should provide the strychnine, which is a very minute amount.

I tried to work it out as a percentage of the State Bank debt but my calculator would not go down to such a fine decimal point. However, it is roughly 1.5 000th of 1 per cent, and as such it is infinitesimal. It is a community problem and should not be lumped onto a few individuals. It is something that will hit the wider community because it could seriously harm our export grain markets, coming as it is into effect only now. The mice are climbing the stems of the grain, nipping it off at the first node and, of course, the head of the grain lays over and cuts off the sap, and so that particular plant is effectively finished.

Because of all these factors it is a potential disaster that needs to be addressed at this stage. It has an impact similar to that of the locust plague. The Government has been good in that case; it has been watching that matter and has been prepared to set aside considerable amounts of money, many times the amount being used for the mouse plague. It is a community problem and the Government does pick up these tabs. The idea of the Government providing the strychnine, providing the supervision for the distribution of the bait, the farmers providing the grain and the cost of spreading, comes out roughly to a 50/50 cost share basis. I believe that is appropriate and I ask the House to support the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

THEBARTON WOMEN'S SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mr BECKER (Hanson): I move:

That this House congratulates the Thebarton Women's Service Association on 72 years of outstanding community service.

During my political career I have never ceased to be amazed at the number of organisations I have come across and the number of volunteers who fulfil a wonderful role within our community. No matter where you go in the metropolitan area, and certainly in the western suburbs, we seem to have a wonderful band of volunteers who give so much of their time, so freely, for the love of their local community.

I was recently invited to the home of the Thebarton Women's Service, whose President, Mrs Cordelia Allen, provided me with some of the background of that organisation. I quote from the document I obtained which highlights some of that background:

Mrs Charlotte Leal and a loyal band of women on 23 June 1921 decided to form the Thebarton Women's Service Association to develop and assist the philanthropic, social, educational and general activities of the town and that the association be non-party and non-sectarian.

They sowed a seed in their mind, a tiny seed, an acorn seed—hoping one day it would grow into a mighty 'oak tree', which it has.

13 branches were formed. Owing to ill health and age, seven branches have had to close. They were Marion, Unley, St Peters, Prospect, Henley and Grange, Glenelg and Woodville. Still together are Kensington and Norwood, Port Adelaide, Brighton, Burnside, Campbelltown and of course Thebarton, the mother association.

My first involvement was with the Glenelg Women's Service and then Henley and Grange as my electorate kept changing. Over the 15 or 16 years I seem to have kept coming across these organisations—this is the third time—and they have provided a wonderful service. The document continues:

In the early days annual meetings were referred to as 'At Homes'. Some sister associations still call it their 'At Home' meeting. Quite a few meetings were held at the Leal residence on Henley Beach Road. They then moved to Parker Street. Mrs Hatwell and Mrs Watson also had meetings in their homes.

Some items of interest the members did in the early 1920s:

They supported the School for Mothers, later known as the Mothers and Babies Health Association.

On 15 November 1923, they purchased a horse and trap for £40. Council was responsible to pay for the feed.

1 929 distressed families were given help; debts were paid off; furniture, bedding, clothing, paint for houses. Men gave their time free of charge to paint.

Food was a must. Many families slept under sugar bags and ate boiled wheat and treacle.

We have people complaining how difficult things are today. Of course, we now appreciate the difficulties that were experienced in those early days, the 1920s and 1930s, and know what a wonderful role the Women's Service organisation played. I continue reading from the document:

On 21 April 1927 Alderman Leal approached the women regarding the Town Hall building. On 20 February 1930 they purchased a car for the Mothers and Babies Health Association and prepared maternity parcels for needy mothers and their babies which included nighties, sheets, towels, pillowcases, baby clothes, nappies, etc. West Torrens also benefited by the car and 1/- [one shilling] per mile was given for fuel.

On 24 March 1924 Harvest Thanksgiving goods were collected for the Southwark Baptist Church, then given to the needy. This was done for many years.

Women collected blankets from the Torrensville Woollen Mills, Michells, to give to the poor—also quite a few jumble stalls were stocked to raise money.

Members were given recess tins from the 1920s and continued with them well after 1962.

There was a wonderful source of income with the pennies, the halfpennies and the threepenny pieces. The trotting club and the horses in action groups had many a function on the Thebarton Oval to assist the association. The women donated two spanking new footballs to the West Torrens Football Club in the early days of pounds, shillings and pence.

During the war years, the women formed the Comfort Fund at Thebarton. Thousands of balaclavas, scarves, socks, mittens, gloves and food parcels were sent to the forces overseas and locally. Cowandilla school and the Thebarton school collected food and clothing to help those in need and they staged a Back to Thebarton in 1924—they were endless fund-raisers. Mrs Allen goes on to say:

Looking back on the 1920s, many stalls were listed. One that caught my eye was a smoke stall—just as well it isn't today with 'no smoking' signs. Another was a toast afternoon. They presented 'Green grow the cabbages', Peddlers Pack, King Competition, Personality Queen Competition, Male or Female—they had a name for everything. 'Busy women' they called themselves. Goodness knows what they did not get up to.

This is typical of what the women in our suburbs did in those years to assist one another. Mrs Allen goes on to state:

In the early days I found homemade sweets were a boom, Cornish pasties, cakes by the thousands—jam, jam and more jam. They made more jam than the jam factories.

The over eighties birthday cakes and a posy were popular. Wreathes cost 17 shillings.

Mrs Hatwell would arrive with perhaps a dozen chooks she had killed and dressed for sale.

They also had the Penny Prick Cards. I well remember them in the early 1940s as fund raising competitions we had in the country. There was the pin in one hand and the card in the other—half the time you would lose the pin. There was a tin for the money; hopefully many pounds, shillings and pence were raised in this way. Mainly, it was a penny a prick, so you had to work pretty hard to collect money.

The Thebarton pictures showed handwritten slides on the screen to advertise forthcoming functions for the Women's Service, free of charge. The Kate Cocks Babies Home and the Leal Memorial Chapel were supported for many years. The Adelaide Children's Hospital was helped with knitting. The girls would bring what they had knitted and over a short period of time there were 169 pairs of bed socks, 138 jackets, 22 dozen eye shields, 72 pairs of bootees, 3 dozen pairs of mittens and bonnets by the dozen.

The Adelaide Hospital kiosk was manned for years. The Thebarton Red Cross was also formed through the Women's Service. Delegates were also affiliated with the National Council of Women until 15 years ago. The Good Neighbour Council, too, had the support of the service. The service formed the Combined Women's Service Association. Presidents and secretaries still hold their meetings.

One rally on 24 June 1936 in the Town Hall had an attendance of 400. About 500 people attended the twenty-first birthday rally on 31 October 1957. Supper on both occasions was held in the Banqueting Room—the Assembly Hall. On 16 August 1956, headquarters took over the Mothers and Babies car. Mothers and Babies meetings were held in the council buildings. The Women's Service made curtains and was responsible for fresh flowers every Monday morning. Mrs Allen said that she well remembers that she left the washing when rostered to make sure flowers were there—as did many other members.

Until a few years ago the Thebarton Women's Service was responsible for all Mothers and Babies business at Thebarton. Some officers who governed the Women's Service were in control of Mothers and Babies. The President, Secretary, Treasurer and members were all paid an affiliation fee.

There was another labour of love for the Women's Service girls. On 17 April 1952, a memorial fund was formed to respect the memory of members passing to 'higher service'. This was money set aside rather than floral tributes to purchase something within the town. On 27 April 1958, Mrs Eve Najar, then Mayoress of the town, approached the women regarding forming an auxiliary for the local hospital. This was done through the Women's Service. Many pieces of equipment have been donated—a wall clock in the entrance, donated by the auxiliary members, along with a cot, a pulse oximeter, an autoclave and many substantial donations of money.

As the hospital has sold its bed licence to Ashford, the auxiliary members have merged and are now members of the Women's Service. The hospital is on a three-year rental to Ashford. And the service is still earmarking money for the fund to assist that organisation. Naturalisations—now citizenship ceremonies—were held in the Assembly Hall.

There was a full procession of scouts, guides, aldermen, councillors, migrants and families. The hall was always full when migrants were first arriving. The service was always filling the sugar basins—they just love sugar and eating the tops off the cakes, according to Mrs Allen. Mrs Allen goes on to say:

We have always prepared suppers for these ceremonies. They are now held in the Mayor's parlour with the ceremony in the council chambers.

The Women's Service still provides the supper today, and that is a wonderful tribute to them and provides a welcome to the migrants within our community.

I now turn to the Ashford House fete. The produce stall was organised by some of the members. They had potatoes by the tonne, melons, cabbages, lettuce, carrots, onions, apples and so on. They claimed that it almost looked like the Central Market. Obviously it was so good that they were fired. They then looked after the morning and afternoon teas, which they did for some 16 years.

The Thebarton Church, Suffolk England, was sent money to restore its organ, the church door and the bell. The Women's Service also purchased armchairs for every room at the Homes for the Aged. They knitted and crocheted knee rugs. The service assisted the Phoenix Society. Members worked for many years in the canteen until there was a paid manager. The service now believes that the disabled people employed at the Phoenix Society fulfil that role. The Women's Service was able to present a cot, a wheelchair and pictures, as well as giving generous donations, to the Adelaide Children's Hospital. While functioning in Thebarton, the Royal District and Bush Nursing Society had the continual support of this service, as did St John and the St John cadets. The St John Building Fund was also given considerable assistance.

The Thebarton Girl Guides, Spastic Guides and the Boy Scouts—the Attunga campsite—were yet other bodies that were helped for many years. The Women's Service was given a Government grant for \$3 000 and it worked and built that up to \$9 000 with \$7 000 in trust with the council. It was able to help purchase the centenary bus and then the jubilee bus, which has been a wonderful help to the women travelling to and from meetings and special outings. Ryall Richards has been the driver for many years and has been a wonderful help to them.

The Women's Service has helped three of the churches that have celebrated their centenaries in the past few years: the Queen of Angels, St James and Holder Memorial. It also helped the Holder Memorial organ fund and its new kitchen. The Women's Service has purchased four pianos for the town: the grand piano in the Mayor's parlour; the Hackwell Memorial Kindergarten piano; the assembly hall piano—which is now known as the reception centre—and the Senior Citizens' Club was given a piano on 17 March 1975.

It purchased curtains and also lino for the health clinic, which unfortunately has been demolished. It also purchased curtains for the reception centre, equipped cupboards with lace cloths, tablecloths, cutlery, pots, crockery, pans, sweet dishes, kettles, and so forth. The service made a banner at one stage—a double-sided 8ft by 3ft item—for King William Street, representing the streets of Thebarton. I well remember that; it was a wonderful display.

Over the years, the Thebarton Women's Service has undertaken many duties and roles in assisting the various organisations within the town. It has been catering for the Mayor and Mayoress's functions, Commonwealth Industrial

Gases Christmas eve for 1 000 people and also for businessmen's lunches for quite a few years. It has also assisted the TAFE college and Adelaide Town Hall in providing suppers for up to 500 people.

It has had wonderful support from the traders within the town and, particularly, the people on Henley Beach Road. Many artists have given their time and talent as have members of the medical profession, their wives and, of course, many of the members have been honoured for their services. There is Mrs Hatwell MBE, Mrs Field MBE and Dorothy McGregor MBE. The Australia Day citizen awards have been given to Cordelia Allen, Nora MacTavish, Mary Richards and Annie Trennery. The Women's Service has supported and assisted 19 mayoresses, 21 mayors, two batchelor mayors and the first Lady Mayoress, Annette O'Reilly.

In 72 years it has had five presidents and five secretaries. It has had wonderful support from the various town clerks, aldermen, councillors, and all the staff involved with the town of Thebarton. It has assisted in over 140 charities, and has had—including mothers and babies health meetings—over 2 000 meetings; and something like 1 400 women have been members of the association over the years. However, it would not have been possible without the men of the town, and the women have been ably supported by those men who have assisted their wives and friends to provide what has been, what is, and what I hope will continue to be a wonderful outstanding service to the town of Thebarton. I hope that all members will support this motion, which recognises the truly great service that these women have given to their community in such an unselfish way. They seek no publicity or recognition, but I believe they are worthy of recognition.

Mr HERON secured the adjournment of the debate.

NETBALL

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I move:

That this House congratulates the Australian Women's Netball Team on its outstanding performance in the recent World Championships by defeating New Zealand to win the World Title and also congratulates the Australian Captain Michelle Fielke and the other two South Australian players, Kathryn Harby and Jennifer Borlase. I have spoken in this House before of the achievements of South Australian netball teams Garville and Contax, which did extraordinarily well in the National League. It is now a very pleasing duty for me to say that some of those players—two of them from Garville and one from Contax—were also in the successful Australian netball team which won the recent World Championships.

It was a wonderful achievement for those teams and it required a lot of work, training and dedication by all the players concerned to achieve that feat. The players who were involved in that team, and the States that they represented were: Michelle Fielke, who was the captain, Jennifer Borlase and Kathryn Harby from South Australia; Sue Kenny, Keeley Devery, Carissa Dalwood and Catriona Wagg from New South Wales; Simone McInnes and Shelley O'Donnel from Victoria; and Vicki Wilson from Queensland. The Australian team also took two reserve players in case of injury, and those two players were Nicole Cusack from New South Wales and Liz Ellis from Victoria.

Australia took a very balanced team with a lot of depth to the world championships. In fact, both the attacking and defending players were extraordinarily competent, and there

was quite a bit of strength across the centre. Michelle Fielke, who is well known to all of us, I believe has been a member of the Australian team since 1989. Jennifer Borlase has also been in the squad, but not necessarily playing in the team over that time. Kathryn Harby has tried out for the team for the past four years, but this is the first time she has been able to make the team. I was very pleased to see that all of the South Australian players were able to play in matches throughout the tournament, which was held at the Hague in Holland. It was always considered that the top three teams would be Australia, New Zealand and Jamaica. England, which in the past has been one of the very strong netball nations, was not considered to be a real danger during the World Championships.

I would expect that the Australian team would be highly elated at having won the gold medal. Unfortunately, Australia was pipped at the post at the last World Championships. Although one of the favourites, it lost to New Zealand in the grand final. While we have been very strong in tests between Australia and New Zealand—and I can well recall the wonderful test recently played between Australia and New Zealand, where the competition was very close and went right down to the wire—for the past five or six years at least Australia has been one of the top contenders in world netball.

Much credit must go to the way netball has been fostered over that period in Australia. Certainly, I would like to pay a tribute to Senator Rosemary Crowley of South Australia who has promoted netball and women's sport for a long time. She has been a strong supporter of the game. I spoke to her about the netball win and she was obviously delighted that at last Australia had triumphed and come out on top as the world champions. On its way to becoming the world champions Australia beat England 64:25; it beat Wales 84:18; and Canada 84:17. The hardest match was against Jamaica, the third seeded team, which Australia won 61:53. It was interesting to watch that contest. The Jamaican goal shooter, Patricia McDonald, was over six feet tall. She is a strong player and it was a matter of just lobbing the ball high enough and she out-jumped Keeley Devery, from New South Wales, who had the dubious task of trying to defend her.

To Keeley Devery's credit she stuck to her job, and between Keeley and Michelle Fielke they were able to block Patricia McDonald out of the game and ensure that Australia beat Jamaica. In the past New Zealand has been our main opposition and the team we usually play off against, but this year New Zealand had only two of its World Championship team from 1989, and those players were the new captain Julie Carter and a defender Robyn Dillimore, who I am sure all netball supporters would remember from the test series in Australia.

New Zealand is fostering some of its younger players but was still confident it had the team to win the World Championship. I am pleased to say that New Zealand did not win the championship. Although Australia lost it in 1989, it was certainly the best team in the world. Although that might sound biased, I do not apologise for that statement because I firmly believe that we had the best team. Australian Captain Michelle Fielke is a wonderful ambassador for Australia and, indeed, is an ambassador for this State.

I was interested to read a press release from the Minister of Business and Regional Development in which it was announced that Michelle Fielke had officially agreed to sell South Australia to the world. We could not have a better ambassador for South Australia. Michelle is well known and has a high profile. She is a delightful person who can promote

us with a great deal of aplomb. I am sure she will be a wonderful ambassador. In announcing the names of the two ambassadors—Sir James Hardy and Michelle Fielke—the Minister said that they were a natural choice. As we all know, the Minister advised that Michelle has been the Australian netball Captain since 1989 and recently led her local club Garville to victory in the Prime Minister's Cup National Mobil Championships, about which we have spoken previously in the House.

Michelle is 27 and has been playing netball in South Australia since the age of seven. We normally find amongst top class players that they start netball very early, and the member for Hanson said, in relation to a previous motion, that much dedication and commitment is required from players, and certainly at this level much dedication and commitment is necessary from all players.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Mrs HUTCHISON: Prior to the dinner adjournment I was just starting to wind up my comments regarding this motion. In summary, I feel that we can be justifiably proud of our Australian netballers and they can feel very proud of their performance in carrying the Australian banner to The Hague. We can also feel very proud of our three State representatives in that team: Michelle Fielke, Jennifer Borlase and Kathryn Harby.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

Mrs HUTCHISON: As the Minister says, Michelle Fielke is our tourism ambassador and I would ask all members of the House to support this motion, as I feel sure they will.

Mr S.G. EVANS (Davenport): This is the type of motion that the House would wish to pass, but because of the shortage of time I will not speak for very long. I can say, as the President of the Adelaide sports club, which is a branch of the Sportsmen's Association of Australia, that Michelle Fielke in particular has showed herself, I believe, to be a great diplomat in the way she conducts herself, whether it be on the sporting arena or whether it be as a diplomat for the sport amongst the sporting community. I can say that in all honesty because of the contacts that have been had through our association with this very capable young lady. The Opposition (that includes Liberal and National Party members) appreciate the motion moved by the honourable member and support all the work she has done in relation to support for the netball team and its success at the world titles. We can be justly proud of them. I do not think I need to say any more because of the shortage of time, but I ask members to support the motion because we do need to recognise our great sporting people.

Mrs HUTCHISON (Stuart): I thank the honourable member for his comments and also the members opposite and members on my own side for the support for this motion.

Motion carried.

POST ADOPTION SERVICES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I move:

That this House condemns the Government for withdrawing funding for the much needed 'Post Adoption Services' and calls on the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services to re-introduce this funding as a matter of urgency.

Having the responsibility for family and community services on this side of the House, I have received a considerable amount of representation regarding this issue. There is a considerable amount of concern and I speak on behalf of the many people who have, in some way, been associated with adoptees. At the outset, I want to commend the Lutheran Community Services for the excellent way in which it has carried out its responsibility in being the nominated group to pilot a scheme of post-adoption services. Unfortunately, the funding for that pilot service expired in July this year. The scheme, under the guidance of the Lutheran Community Services, has been of much benefit to all parties of the adoption triangle under the capable and, I believe, unbiased leadership of Jay Robinson. It is with very great regret that the service has had to close and it is a sad loss to the adoption community.

It is essential that some body or service should be available to counsel these people in a totally unbiased way. It is also essential that the board of any group that may be established should have representation from all groups connected with adoption—the adopted person, the adoptive parents and the birth parents—so that a balance can be maintained. I cannot emphasise that too much. The priorities are for the Government to provide funding to reinstate a service for these people and to ensure, if that service is provided, that it is provided in a balanced way without any bias to any one group affected in this area.

I am sure that all members will appreciate the sensitivity of this subject and that the majority at some time have received representations from adopted persons, adoptive parents or birth parents. I have received representations from almost every area associated with adoptions and on a number of occasions I have been asked to consider amending the legislation in support of one or other of these groups and their concerns.

I have refrained from attempting to introduce private member's legislation in this regard because it is a very sensitive area. We need only to look at the debate that took place when the legislation was before the House previously. I believe it is the responsibility of the Government to consider such matters. I assure those who are concerned and interested in this subject that a future Liberal Government would, on coming to office, review this legislation and seek wide consultation to enable appropriate decisions to be made.

I have received quite a bit of correspondence and there has been representation through various forms of the media about the closure of this adoption service. Many questions have been asked about why it was necessary to close its doors on 30 June, leaving potentially thousands affected by adoption without counselling and support. Earlier I mentioned Jay Robinson, who for some time has had responsibility in working with these people. Just prior to the closure of the service I was fortunate to be invited to attend one of the meetings organised by Jay. It provided an excellent opportunity for me to talk to some of the people who felt very strongly that a service was needed to enable them to ask questions, to seek assistance and to make representations in regard to their numerous concerns. Many questions were being asked at that stage about why it was necessary for the Minister of Health, Family and Community Services to close the service and to remove the funding. In particular, it was felt that no satisfactory response had been provided by the Minister for that action.

State Government funding worth \$80 000 was made available in 1991 for this post-adoptive service pilot project

in order to get it off the ground, operating, as I said earlier, under the auspices of Lutheran Community Care. The project opened its doors in February last year. I realise that the funding was never intended to last past 30 June this year, but what I do not understand is why a service so much in demand, with new clients increasing by 60 per cent since last November, was allowed to die at the end of the pilot stage, leaving hundreds of people high and dry without assistance and without the expertise that they needed.

It is not a minority problem. There are 14 000 adoptees in South Australia—and their families. Some of the hundreds of people who have been counselled are now confident enough to be referred to other services. But a little time ago, just prior to the actual closing down of the service, I understand that nearly 200 adopted persons, plus adoptive parents, siblings and grand parents, had no place for further referral—not to mention people who have not yet found their way to other forms of assistance. It is a dreadful waste of professional energy and taxpayers' money to have proved a need for a service and then to take away that service.

I sincerely hope that the Minister himself will respond to this motion, and I know it is not always the practice in this place for that to happen. I believe that there is a need for the Minister to give an explanation as to why he found it necessary to close down that service. We all realise that there are significant economic problems facing this State, but that is not the responsibility nor the fault of the people on whose behalf I am speaking tonight. I had hoped to be able to refer to a significant amount of correspondence that I have received on this subject, but I might just refer to a copy of a letter that was written to the Prime Minister by a person at Angaston. That person writes:

Over the last few months we have been bombarded by news of children being abducted, children getting sexually assaulted (even in the school playground), people getting stabbed to death or run over by a vehicle or an innocent person is being killed on our roads due to some moron wanting to have fun baiting police into high speed chases.

It is with that background that the writer goes on to indicate how angry she is at present, as she continues to fill out a half a dozen forms because her husband and herself want to adopt a child. She goes on to say:

We have to be subjected to a full medical check at our own expense, have a police record check, fill out forms asking about our personal and financial status, and to top that off, we have to write about ourselves in no less than four pages and no more than 10 pages, get proof about ourselves, etc., then send all the forms off to the Department of Community Services, including a cheque for \$500.

She indicates that they have already paid a deposit of \$50 for expression of interest. She goes on to say:

...then, if we get accepted to go on the adoptions register, we will have to attend parenting courses for 18 months, then pay another fee of \$700 thereafter (even more if you are applying to adopt overseas). Then there are still no guarantees, after doing all the above, you are going to be fortunate enough to get a much wanted child of your own. If we do not have a child placed with us within three years, we will be invited to reapply to go through the above procedure again, including paying more fees etc.

You may think I have nothing to complain about, but we have almost put ourselves into debt because, prior to putting in an adoption application, we had been in the IVF program for the last three years and virtually went through the same procedure of red tape just to be accepted on the program. Yet the people who are going through the program are regarded as not having the same rights under our health care system because we are only covered for six IVF cycles; then the rest comes out of our own pocket. Believe me, there's a lot that comes out of our pocket now towards the IVF program.

Why do I get this horrible feeling that those of us who dearly would love to have children, through no fault of our own, are

seemingly being punished by not giving us and the clinics the financial assistance needed to ease at least one burden off our shoulders as well as helping towards more research in this field? There are a lot more of us couples going through the program than you parliamentarians probably realise.

Why is it then that people like us, who dearly would like to have a family, have to go through all this red tape in order to see whether we are going to be good or fit enough parents? It feels at times that we are the ones who are standing in the judgment box and being given the verdict of guilty for an assumed crime of desperately wanting to have children of our own.

And the letter goes on. That is one side of the argument. That is a situation where people are desperately in need of more assistance, and in this respect I refer to those who wish to have a family of their own, who are not able to have children but who want to adopt. There is a desperate need for those people to be assisted. As I said earlier, there is a further need and an extensive need for services to be provided for those who have been adopted, those who want to adopt, the parents of those who have been adopted and the parents who will adopt.

I sincerely hope that the Minister will come into this place at a later stage and respond to this motion to provide the evidence which is being sought after as to why this Government found it necessary to withdraw the funds to close down that pilot program. It was proved conclusively to be an excellent service that was much needed in the community, and I would ask all members of this House to recognise the concerns of those people and to support this motion.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENTERPRISE ZONES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That this House deplores the limitation of the Government's enterprise zones to two Labor held areas of the State and urges the Government to extend its enterprise zones to additional areas of the State forthwith.

Members will well recall the economic statement 'Meeting the Challenge' by Premier Lynn Arnold some four months ago. Under the heading 'Enterprise Zones' in that statement, the Premier said:

In recognition of the vital role that new investment must play in the State's economic future, the Government will establish two enterprise zones within which new approved investment will achieve favourable Government treatment. This is modelled on successful overseas models where zones have been established to attract new, strategic investment by offering a range of services, incentives and concessions for industries locating in the zone. Assistance will be in the form of relief from taxes, charges, regulations and approvals, 10-year tax holidays (including payroll tax, FID, the bank account debits tax, land tax, stamp duties, etc.), and concessional electricity and water charges will be negotiated.

Certainly one can only applaud the establishment of enterprise zones in this State. The negative side is that the enterprise zones have been restricted to two Labor held areas of South Australia. It is essential for this State's growth that we enlarge those zones to cover other areas of the State. I am sure other members will wish to identify projects that would be able to be brought into their particular areas.

I would like to highlight two or three projects in the short time available to me that are needed in my electorate of Goyder. The first project relates to Gulf Link, a ferry linkage proposed between Wallaroo and Franklin Harbour. The document entitled 'Essential Reading for Representatives of the People of South Australia regarding the Gulf Link Spencer Gulf Roll On Roll Off Ferry Project' states:

Your support for this vital transport infrastructure initiative would help Gulf Link to create 500 construction jobs in 1993; create 74 new

permanent jobs and more part-time positions from 1993 onwards; and increase State tax revenues by an estimated \$600 000 per annum. In fact, it involves not only what the Gulf Link representatives have said. Members should listen to what some members of Parliament have said. Tim Fischer, Leader of the Federal National Party, said in 1992:

It is an exciting concept but clearly one which involves a degree of commitment from the State Government.

Premier Lynn Arnold, in September 1992, said:

I am pleased to advise you that your proposal has the in-principle support of the Government and wish you well in what I hope will be a very profitable venture for Gulf Link.

The Minister of Business and Regional Development said, following my comments in this House during the last session:

I reassure you that the Government is committed to sustainable regional development and to those projects which can demonstrate net tangible benefits to the State.

The banks have all endorsed the project, those banks being the National Bank, the Westpac Bank, the ANZ Capel Court and the Commonwealth Bank.

In March 1993 an article in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* stated:

Gulf Link directors have been advised by the Economic Development Authority of South Australia. . . that the Spencer Gulf ferry project may be considered for financial support by the Government of South Australia.

So there has been hope, hope, hope! Yet the Government has refused to include this as part of its enterprise zone, where so many incentives could have been brought into play to ensure that this project proceeded and was a success.

I would like to give a few more details of the project as it relates to the concept, as follows:

Gulf Link has identified a promising business opportunity to provide a roll-on roll-off vehicular ferry service for a 36.5 nautical mile crossing of the upper Spencer Gulf in South Australia. Introduction of the ferry service will provide substantial time, cost and road distance savings compared with the present alternative of driving around the gulf.

A table that has been provided shows that there will be road distance savings of some 440 kilometres on the interstate Adelaide/Perth Eyre Highway route and a saving of 658 kilometres on the intrastate Adelaide/Port Lincoln Highway route—phenomenal savings in distance. They go into various details on other savings relating to this whole project.

I urge every member, if they have not seen the 'Essential Reading' document and the 'Information memorandum and financial synopsis for a roll on roll off ferry service across Spencer Gulf, South Australia to seek such documents, to read them and to ensure that they do their part to help establish one more important business in this State. I received recently from Mr Peter Davis of Boston Island a copy of a letter that had been written to the Editor of the *Advertiser*. I do not believe this letter has been published, but he said, amongst other things—

Mr Blacker interjecting:

Mr MEIER: As the member for Flinders says, it has been published in local papers but not in the *Advertiser*, and I hope that the *Advertiser* might still see fit to publish it. He says:

The brief article by your Catherine Bauer, entitled 'S.A. warned of social unrest,' on August 4 1993, left me with a feeling of enraged contempt for the State Government's Economic Development Authority.

Their draft report 'Regaining Prosperity' tabled in Parliament yesterday allegedly highlights the ills that will befall our State unless eight strategies are implemented to help kickstart our economy. . .

This body of worthy bureaucrats has seen fit to fiddle with a transport project that has huge ramifications, not just for my region, nor the State but our nation as a whole. . .

It is now two, going on three, years since the Gulf Link Ferry project has been scrutinised, EIS-ised, financial feasibility-ised, and politicised.

Here sits a project in limbo; 500 start up jobs, 120 full time jobs, tourism development, regional development and decentralisation, major distance reductions, huge benefits for the national heavy freight industry, et cetera. . . In limbo, Sir, all for the sake of some financial courage and a splattering of vision on behalf of a few bureaucrats and politicians.

He goes on to indicate that a little courage and vision is needed and that it is sadly lacking in this State.

I also have correspondence from the Corporation of Wallaroo. Amongst other things it points out that the Arthur D. Little report states on page 15:

Some sea transport links are, or could be, significant for movement of cargoes within the State. . . If proposals for a Spencer Gulf ferry link from Wallaroo to the Eyre Peninsula south-west of Cowell proceed, about five hours would be cut from the present road journey between Adelaide and lower peninsula centres.

It says other things that support this ferry project. The disappointing thing is that when the Mayor of Wallaroo and his Chief Executive Officer met with a representative from the Economic Development Authority they found, after being kept waiting for 20 minutes, his response to their questions and suggestions extremely negative. To add insult to injury, after 20 or 30 minutes the officer kept looking at his watch and indicated that he had another meeting. The Mayor said:

Had I been there as a developer and received that reaction I can assure you I would have left, never to return.

It is tragic that the bureaucracy in this State seems to ignore such obvious potential developments—a development that can provide 500 jobs. Yet the Government sits on its behind and does nothing. I wish to highlight a second project, in the Wakefield Plains area, in relation to which I again ask the Minister to consider extending the enterprise zones. I refer to the Arisa project. Arisa hopes to have a mill that will make about 60 000 tonnes of unbleached paper pulp from wheat straw for export to Asia. About 90 000 tonnes of straw will be purchased each year when the mill reaches full production. It will also purchase up to 8 000 tonnes of selected craft waste paper each year.

Arrangements for the sale of the pulp that the mill will produce were completed early in 1992 when Arisa accepted an offer from Price and Pierce to purchase all the output from the mill. Price and Pierce is one of the world's leading trading houses in the pulp and paper industry. In fact it was established over 100 years ago in the United Kingdom and it is active in the pulp paper markets of Asia, where Arisa's product will be sold. Arisa has the potential to provide up to 130 jobs. That includes the people employed in pulp mill operations, harvest and transport and other services and in indirect employment.

In fact, the economy of South Australia will benefit from the project by the increased economic activity in the Mid North region, especially in the District Council of Wakefield Plains area. The benefits will include regional and rural employment and increased farm income and additional port throughput. There are environmental advantages in the utilisation of waste paper, in the reduction of burning of straw and in some cases in improved agricultural practices. It is a step towards sustained development as it utilises the byproduct of cereal production and reduces the need to burn straw. South Australian farmers will thus have an advantage if the burning of straw is prohibited as a result of local or overseas requirements.

It is compatible with the South Australian Government's stated policy to add value to agricultural products through further processing and to lift export performance in the growth area of world trade. What fantastic endorsements for this Arisa project. In fact, value adding will be about 55 per

cent. Again, it is imperative that the Government give consideration to extending the enterprise zones so that these sorts of companies do not have to wait around and trust that the climate will be right whilst they are doing everything they can. Just as those involved in the ferry project are doing all in their power, so is Arisa doing everything in its power to set up. The Government could be in there actively helping and I urge it to do so through the extension of its enterprise zones.

Similarly, there is the Gilmac project. Members will have heard of the Balco project, which is up and running in the Clare area. The Gilmac project is very similar. In fact, it is a \$1.5 million hay processing and export plant. Gilmac is a Western Australian firm and it has indicated that it is prepared to invest \$1.5 million in buildings, plant and machinery, with negotiations currently under way on several sites near Balaklava. In fact, I believe that it has now decided on a site.

The plant will be capable of pressing 150 tonnes per day. It will be operated by two people per shift using three shifts and it is anticipated that there will be total staff of some 10 to 12 persons. The company's principal shareholders indicated that they saw South Australia as an excellent location for a new processing plant, with large areas that they regard as premium hay growing country and hence they united to form Gilmac. Gilmac will require some 15 000 tonnes of oat and hay for the 1993-94 cropping season increasing to 25 000 tonnes in the 1994-95 cropping season. It has asked the local farmers for support because they will require oat and hay to be grown in large quantities, and in fact the long-term viability of the project will rely on farmers' support. The Japanese dairy industry will take the plant's total output—so another Asian market.

I highlight these three projects as three examples out of many in my electorate that could be up and running and these would certainly be much further advanced if the Government simply extended the enterprise zones or, at the very least, if it showed more interest. Balco has had problems getting Government support, as indicated earlier. Wakefield Plains in its new supplementary development plan has actually provided an enterprise zone, a zone which provides a diversity of activities, including rural industries, manufacturing tanneries, intensive animal keeping storage and the reception and disposal of waste and farming.

It is all set up: the Government only has to say, 'We give it our backing, we will provide the incentives that are provided in enterprise zones, such as relief from taxes, charges, regulations and approvals, a 10 year tax holiday, and so on, as I mentioned earlier. But the Government continues to sit on its hands. It will not take action. I ask the Premier and the Minister for Business and Regional Development to please act and I would hope that a statement will be forthcoming in tomorrow's budget so that the enterprise zones can extend in my area and many other areas.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired.

Mrs HUTCHISON secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES REPEAL AND AMENDMENT (PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE (REPEAL AND VESTING) BILL

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY (Minister of Labour Relations and Occupational Health and Safety) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to repeal the Parks Community Centre Act 1981. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.J. GREGORY: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill, which is to repeal the Parks Community Centre Act, follows a review of the Parks Community Centre by the Government Agencies Review Group at the request of the Parks Community Centre Board.

The repeal of the Act will result in the Board of the Centre and the Corporate Management Structure being abolished and replaced by a Corporate Management structure of four groups:

- A Parks Community Cultural and Recreation Centre
- A Parks Education, Employment and Training Group
- A Building and Property Service Office
- Social Support Services

The primary objective of this approach is to redistribute resources to more effectively meet the known needs of the Parks local community in an economic climate of restrained budgetary allocations. Funding to achieve this objective can only be met through savings in efficiency, resources and full cost recovery from the agencies operating at the Parks Community Centre.

It is proposed that the administrative and financial functions of the Parks Community Centre be assumed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

I would like to thank the Board and staff of the Centre for their dedication to the Parks Community Centre. In many cases this has occurred over several years. I am also appreciative of their co-operation in bringing about the changes that I have already outlined.

Clauses 1 and 2:

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Interpretation:

This clause defines the terms used in the Bill.

Clause 4: Vesting of centre's assets and liabilities in the Minister: All the property, rights and liabilities of the Parks Community Centre are vested in the Minister of Recreation and Sport. The clause provides that any reference to the Parks Community Centre in any instrument or in any court document is to be taken as being a reference to the Minister and any legal proceedings commenced by or against the centre may be continued by or against the Minister.

Clause 5: Transfer of interests in land:

This provides that the Register-General will, on the application of the Minister and on being given duplicate certificates of title or any other documents that might be required, register the Minister as the proprietor of any interests in land vested in the Minister by this Act. No registration fee is payable for this application.

Clause 6: Repeal of Parks Community Centre Act:

This clause repeals the Parks Community Centre Act 1981.

Mr OSWALD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTHERN POWER AND WATER BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from 24 August. Page 466.)

Clause 13—'Functions of the corporation.'

The CHAIRMAN: After three hours of debate we are still on clause 13.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Thank you kindly, Mr Chairman. Yes, after three hours we are still on clause 13, and we are going to be on that clause for a little longer. We had been discussing insurance and risk management, including estimated figures indicating that one organisation needed 14 risk managers, and we could understand why ETSA should have a very strong risk management team, given the fall-out from the 1983 Ash

Wednesday bushfires. So, I am sure that there is a need for ongoing monitoring of risk that might be sustained by ETSA.

We are also aware that ETSA is not covered under natural disasters, which means that, if ETSA is involved and contributes to any significant loss of damage or life, it will still be responsible for the bills resulting from such a disaster. The Minister was going to give us a little more information. With ETSA having 14 risk managers to ensure that its risks are minimised, he has said that with the two new organisations there will be only 12, yet the size of the organisation is virtually being doubled.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I did indeed indicate that I was going to get some information for members, and I want to spend a little time on this because it is an interesting topic. The honourable member is quite right, in that the ETSA people have had to have a very strong team insuring externally from ETSA. The Ash Wednesday bushfires created a very difficult situation, with the insurance at that stage being remarkably low. Nothing had happened for a long time, and straight after the bushfires it increased to a very high level. In fact, from April 1984 to 1985 the insurance cost for ETSA was \$91 000 per \$1 million of coverage, which was quite a significant percentage. Over the years, partly due to some very careful work done by that team of people, and also due to the tree cutting regulations that came into this House for consideration about five years ago, as members will recall, the insurance steadily dropped, and by 1987-88 it was \$8 million for \$300 million cover with a \$25 million excess.

By July 1991-92 it had dropped to \$4.8 million for a \$500 million cover, with a policy excess of \$20 million. So, one can see that enormous amounts of work and careful manoeuvring, I suppose, had to be done in order to drive those insurance costs down, and it was worth having a number of people working on that because of the immense gains that they made. It is now true that the insurance industry has hardened up to the point where reductions are now less likely. Again, there is a law of diminishing returns here also.

I also want for a moment to reflect on the figure of \$20 million for the insurance premium for Southern Power and Water that I understand the Opposition has come up with. I can only assume that they have said, 'It is costing ETSA about \$10 million to insure and, if we double that, that is \$20 million, and that seems about right.' That is wrong on several counts. First, ETSA is paying only \$8 million, so it should have been \$16 million if one followed the logic. But there is a certain naivety to that logic also.

Even if you insure larger amounts, the probability diversity of having a problem occur in ETSA and in the E&WS in the same year is such as to drive the overall premium down. That does not happen if you have the two insured separately, because you would insure for risk in ETSA and you would insure for risk in E&WS. You might insure with two different companies or run two separate premiums with the same company, and you would not get this probability diversity factor which drives the insurance down.

Interestingly enough, I also indicated to people that I would bring forward some backing evidence for the claim I made yesterday that, even when you have E&WS and ETSA insured together, it was likely that you would still have a premium of only \$8 million dollars. I will read out a paragraph of a letter to the Manager, Risk and Insurance of ETSA, dated 24 August, as follows:

Subject to a placement based on deductibles commensurate with the size and type of the merged utility, we believe that an insurance

placement could be achieved for a total insurance premium of the order of \$8 million.

That comes from Alexander and Alexander, ETSA's insurers. That figure was not plucked out of the air. There is therefore a very large difference between the Opposition's view that the cost would be of the order of \$20 million and ETSA's insurer's view that the cost would probably be of the order of \$8 million.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That begs the question on a number of counts. Can the Minister please inform the Committee exactly what is the first element of risk that ETSA has to carry itself; what is the first element of risk that E&WS has to carry itself; and, if there is an extraordinary disaster, over what figure would ETSA or E&WS become liable?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Clearly, I am not in a position to give those figures for E&WS because they have not yet been negotiated. The letter to Mr Groves indicates that it is subject to a number of concerns, and that is why it is of the order of \$8 million. With regard to ETSA, the policy excess is \$50 million for a bushfire. It varies for a number of other things. It can be for amounts less than that because ETSA insures not only for bushfires.

Mr S.J. BAKER: To clarify that, if we do have a bad situation arise, then the first \$50 million has to be met by ETSA, and one would assume that a similar figure would prevail in relation to E&WS if an earthquake, for instance, caused a reservoir to break under stress and strain.

So, we could say that the first \$50 million must be met. I will go back one step. I could get insurance for ETSA for \$1 if I said that I would cover the first \$1 000 million of risk—that is the nature of the insurance industry. So, we are looking at the probabilities and the extent to which the international community will take that risk, because we are subject to reinsurance. I do not know whether the Minister has the figure, but my understanding is that the total catastrophe insurance stops at about \$400 million for the State Government. If you partition the risks according to the function—I do not know how that will work; I am looking for some guidance from the Minister—on the one hand, we have ETSA with a limit of \$50 million—and no limit to the amount that is paid out by international insurers—while on the other hand, the E&WS Department could be liable for the first \$50 million if there were to be an insurance scheme. However, because that element of the operation falls within the State Government's responsibility, the E&WS Department would take its risks along with all the other elements of the public sector and be subject to capping of \$400 million. I have some interest in this issue, and if that is the case we would have a very strange policy. I seek guidance on how that situation would be catered for.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must disagree with some of the earlier statements that the honourable member made. The situation that would apply in a bushfire would be very different from the one that would apply in the case of the E&WS, because in an E&WS situation the asset would be at risk. Whether it be a pipeline breaking, a dam bursting or a sewage treatment works being affected by an earthquake, the risk is limited to the cost of that particular item, whereas in the case of a bushfire the risk is pretty well unlimited because, if the bushfire were big enough and affected enough people, killed, injured and destroyed sufficiently, no containable figure could be put on that risk. So, in my view, it is highly unlikely that the cost to the E&WS would be anywhere near the cost of bushfire insurance.

Mr S.J. Baker: I accept that; I do not have a problem with that.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: The honourable member accepts that that is a reasonable proposition. I do not have at my fingertips the figures requested by the honourable member in the latter part of his question. I think that that is the type of information that will be requested by and supplied to a select committee, should one be set up in another place.

Mr S.J. Baker: With regard to the same issue, ETSA has reserves of \$120 million against this sort of event. This means that if two bad events occurred in the space of a year—the policy may cover numerous events in one year with \$50 million being the total pay-out, I am not sure—the reserves would go. The suggestion has been put to me that the Government is about to commandeer the reserves of \$120 million. I would like to know from the Minister his exact intention in this regard.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: That money will go to Southern Power and Water in exactly the same way as will the fully funded superannuation of \$400 million. If one wanted to take that attitude, both those sums would have been accessible by Government at any time in the past. So, nothing will change as a result of this merger.

Mr S.J. Baker: I appreciate that, and I am sure the Minister will come back to me on the issue of the petitioning of the risks and how they are to be catered for in the new organisation. The Government is saying that, because of what the Commonwealth has deemed appropriate and because of the existing systems that remain within the public sector, one half of the organisation may be under one insurance policy and the other half under another insurance policy. As to the estimates, which is one of the matters we are testing, there will be some additional costs because of corporatisation.

The Minister has talked about \$2 million or \$3 million, which is an additional corporatisation cost for the E&WS Department. However, I leave that aside and return to the risk managers. Either ETSA is now overburdened with risk managers because they have done their job particularly well, or the E&WS Department is not going to have any risk managers, and I would be somewhat startled if that was so. There is an assumption that two employees will be lost.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: We are still in a situation that has existed from the beginning of this debate. The honourable member and I are talking from different sides of the fence, and I doubt we will ever get to a point where we can talk to each other on the same basis. He is saying that, if we have an organisation that requires insurance to be negotiated for it, we need people to do that. I am saying exactly the same thing. The honourable member claims that, with two organisations, more people are required if they are both externally insured. Again, I am not arguing with that. I am saying that, when we join two organisations into one, which is the intent of the merger, we end up with one organisation and we need only one team of people to negotiate insurance for it.

As I have said, we have been through a difficult situation in ETSA where premiums have had to be renegotiated each year, but that is now likely to ease off because we appear to have reached a plateau situation. It appears to me that a slight reduction in the number of people who will do the work on behalf of a single organisation is a reasonable way to go about it.

Mr S.J. Baker: As the Minister said, we are a mile apart on this issue. As a mathematician of some reasonable capacity, I believe that, if we have one organisation that

requires 14 and a double size organisation that requires 12, it can lead to only one conclusion: either the figures are wrong or there is a lot of flesh in ETSA at the moment. On either count, the Minister has failed the fifth test. It is a matter of how much reliability we place on the figures. We are going to be a mile apart because it is a simple matter of mathematics. Either there is too much flesh in the organisation right now which should be removed or the figures are wrong.

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: I wonder what one ought to think about people who say, on the one hand, 'Yes, we are poles apart,' and on the other hand say, 'And you are wrong and you have failed.' If both the honourable member and I had been saying that, we would not have advanced the argument at all. There would be claim and counterclaim across the Chamber about who had failed the test. Where does that get us? The honourable member has this fixation about tests but, as a former teacher, I have already told him that I do not have that fixation. I have given enough tests in my lifetime not to want to face another one.

The honourable member needs to be aware that not only has ETSA had to go through the renegotiation of virtually annual premiums but also the Ash Wednesday claims, of which there were several thousand, were processed over that period, and they are close to being finalised. Only a few remain. All the work in dealing with about 2 200 claims has been finalised over 10 years. It is almost at an end and it is therefore perfectly reasonable to expect that we will not need the same number of people to deal with the general insurance situation within the organisations as we have previously.

Mr S.J. Baker: Can I ask the Minister (and there must be a lot of people waiting in the side lines to be sacked if that was the case) how much in claims is outstanding at this moment?

The Hon. J.H.C. Klunder: I do not have those figures with me, but that up-to-date information was given to the member for Heysen last week, so it is already in the hands of the Liberal Party.

Mr S.J. Baker: We will have obvious difficulty in reconciling any figures. As I said, we have done five tests on the labour supply side, and the Minister has failed every test. It is not that I am being difficult, I might add: I am simply trying to make the point that the figures are crook. They do not compute. It is entirely appropriate that the select committee proceed. However, I will cut my losses, because it was my intention to spend every hour that this Parliament could provide going through every set of figures to get some substantiation. From what we have seen already, if I went through the 30 lines that we would have to look at, I think we would have 30 failures. I am not going to do that; I am going to say to the Minister, 'You have proved one thing, and that is that the figures do not hang together.'

I will now take on two major items and see where the Minister finishes. All members recognise that there is \$56 million worth of potential savings, according to the Government; that has been the latest broadsheet. It did get up to about \$120 million but it has dropped back to \$56 million. About 40 per cent of those savings are locked into two items. Whilst we have considerable difficulty reconciling, and indeed cannot reconcile, the labour figures in one particular group, we will have to set that issue aside and, as the Minister has said, that is a matter that may well have to be pursued at another place, at another time and in a different venue.

I would like now to talk about information technology. According to the broadsheet or the information that has been provided, information technology will return savings of

\$17.26 million (we will just say \$17 million). Of that, the content of labour is some \$6.6 million in the amended sheet that we received. I do thank the Minister because I know that when figures have to be prepared in a hurry to satisfy our requirements mistakes are sometimes made in transposition. I recognise that the set of figures with which we were dealing last night may not have been all that helpful to the Minister because one or two of the columns had been transposed.

However, I would like to look at information technology, first, from the technology point of view and, secondly, in relation to the manpower or people input into the process. I would like to ask about the \$10 million to \$27 million per annum savings (although we have got that down to \$17 million), because it is a very important component of the total savings. As far as I am aware the E&WS is locked into a \$38 million project with ETSA. As a precursor to the subject, I might add that the issue of computers—of information technology—is not one in relation to which the Government could stand up tall and say it has handled particularly well. I only have to mention the Justice Information System which started off at \$18 million, finished up at \$55 million and did not necessarily compute with the original design and aims of the system due to the courts deciding to go their own way.

In other areas we have found massive failures in the way that the Government operates computers. They are difficult beasts, subject to expertise that most of us do not have. Indeed, we are often at the mercy of people who sell the machines. Having dealt with computer salesmen over a period of time, I know that they will explain all the wonderful things that the machine will do—if only one had the expertise—and then we find that they fail to meet our requirements because they are not compatible with other machinery or because the software applications are not developed sufficiently for them to reach their full capacity. I think that is a fair statement.

With regard to information technology, I have to ask about the so-called \$10 million of capital saving each year as a result of the amalgamation. Can the Minister tell me exactly what is happening with the E&WS computer and the extent to which it is locked into a contract for the purchase and establishment cost of \$38 million?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am happy to provide an answer to the honourable member. By way of a precursor, I agree that the computer area has been very difficult not just for the Government, but for virtually every organisation that has tried to come to grips with the need to become literate in that area to utilise that technology. When I chaired the Public Accounts Committee some years ago, we produced a report on that matter, because it was clear that a number of agencies were falling for the three-card trick of computer salesmen and were ascribing savings to things which were illusory. Clearly there are some difficulties in this area.

The contract with Tandem Computers by the E&WS Department was entered into in June 1992, which was before the second agency was brought under my control, and that did not take place until October of that year. The Tandem computer will be continued and both organisations will continue with their existing information technology equipment until such time as it becomes outdated or more cost-effective to change over.

However, a number of things will happen and cause savings. The first is that software licences—I may have said this yesterday—for the business systems can be used by the new merged authority for very little increase in cost. The

authority will use the spare capacity in each of the computers, regardless of whether they originated with the E&WS or ETSA, so that it will be possible to cut back on the buying of new machines. I am talking not about the major pieces of computing machinery, but about the ancillary machinery that is often necessary to do the various other jobs apart from the main ones which deal with charging, paying, and so on. There will be a direct saving because of the capacity to pool the computers and to have the computer space available on each other's machines to which they would not previously have had access.

It is also true that the two sets of computing equipment will be centralised to a single place. By that token, a large number of people will be surplus to requirements, because the same number of people will not be required to look after equipment on one site as are required to look after equipment on two separate sites. That will be one of the major savings. I think that I have probably answered the honourable member's question, so I will let him ask the next one.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister has answered my question more than adequately. Again the figures have fallen down. So on the seventh test the Minister has fallen at the hurdle. There is a projected saving of virtually \$10 million in capital and software. The computers are not compatible. The Minister is now talking about physically moving these beasts to another location—something with which I think the computer experts might have a little bit of difficulty, although it is achievable. Once you install a mainframe—and these are large mainframes in the scheme of things—you do not necessarily try to move them around too much because you can cause untold damage, and they are reasonably sensitive sorts of machines. Of course, I do not know how heavy they are. I know that the Taxation Department had terrible problems with its computers because they were too heavy for the floors. A number of design criteria may not necessarily be met if you put two lots of computers together. Unlike the Minister, I do not believe there are a lot of savings in putting two lots of computers together, even if it were technically easy to do or it could be done at a reasonable price.

The Minister then might say, 'Well, both these machines have excess capacity. We presume that we are to undertake the functions that are best done by the ETSA machine, so we will concentrate on the ETSA machine and those functions that are best done by the E&WS Tandem computer.' Again there is a problem: you have to convert the data to the different machines—and we all know how difficult that can be. So many issues are involved. I do not pretend to be an expert. However, I cannot believe any consultant who comes up with savings in this area, when you have already invested about \$50 million and said that there is \$10 million worth of savings. There is a sunk cost.

Unless there is complete compatibility—and that is the thing that I started yelling and screaming about years ago—you will have dysfunction in the system. Conversion of common factors will cause an enormous amount of stress and strain. More rather than fewer people will be needed. More expert people will be required on software, design and all the necessary ancillary services. So there might be a pay out time of, say, four or five years in terms of converting the machines before there is actually any benefit. What the Minister said is that there is a \$10 million benefit which is virtually in train very quickly. He has quite clearly stated in his answer that there is not a \$10 million saving. In fact, if his design on the machinery was correct, significant costs could be involved in moving the machines and significant costs—millions of

dollars—involved in converting them so they can accept the common functions, whether they be accounting, meter reading or voltage systems (because the E&WS might have a need for its own power) and all those sorts of systems. If we say, 'We will have a common-purpose computer to handle certain functions,' it is simply not achievable right at the moment.

So, the \$10 million is not a plus but a negative. I have not heard anything from the Minister to the date that would suggest that it is not. However, I am willing to listen. Leaving aside the sunk cost, namely, the capital cost and the software cost endemic to the system because of the purchases that have been made, how much is actually being spent on other functions in terms of software, because we must assume that there will be savings in that area?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must state that I do not believe that the honourable member would have ever come to the conclusion that the figures do add up, no matter what information I provided him with.

Mr S.J. Baker: I've got my select committee; I'm just trying hard.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think the honourable member is trying to get some information prior to the select committee so that he can compare it with the information that is given in the select committee. I give the honourable member credit for having brains. He is certainly not so stupid that he would not be trying that. The point really is several fold. Whether the honourable member believes me is irrelevant: what is relevant is that the computer experts inside the two agencies who have put those agencies on computers and who have kept them there with the computers working well believe that these things are achievable.

The independent assessment by the external consultant indicates that these savings are achievable. So whether the honourable member and I believe it or whether we both vehemently disagree with it is irrelevant. If the experts believe it, I have to go with the experts, not with the view of somebody who on the one hand says, 'This is not my area of expertise.' I freely admit that it is not my area of expertise either, but I do not believe somebody who says, 'It is not my area of expertise.' That is fine. Whether he believes it or not is his business. Whether or not those savings are achievable is up to the experts in the field to decide, and the experts in the field have told me that it is possible.

The honourable member might be pleasantly surprised if he looked at the computer systems in each of these agencies. The days when you had rooms of a specific size, with specially reinforced floors, air conditioning that worked to within the nearest tenth of a degree in order to keep your computers operating are past. Those computers are now the size of a desk, or even smaller, and they do exactly the same job and they do it every bit as well.

Again, if my experts tell me that you can shift these computers to put them in a common location, I am inclined to believe them because they are the people who work with computers their entire lives. There is nothing as protective as a computer technician towards his computer. If a computer technician or a computer scientist believed that a computer could not be shifted and that it would be dangerous to the computer to shift it, you would not believe the kind of turn these people put on. These machines are very important to them. They spend their lives working with them and they want to make sure that those machines get the best treatment.

So whether the honourable member believes we ought to be having special moving equipment, special floors and

special rooms is irrelevant. What matters is what the experts tell me and that is what I go with, because I probably have expertise in this area that is roughly equivalent to that of the honourable member, and that is fairly minimal.

I want to pick up the honourable member on a statement he made, because I think that he is still of the impression that we are going to try to join the two major systems, and that is not what will happen. Both of them will be allowed to run their 'natural lives'. I agree with the honourable member that to try to put translation gates between machines that use different languages is often fraught with danger. Whether that has been recognised or whether it is for other reasons, the advice I am getting is that the two machines will be allowed to operate separately until their useful lives are past.

Mr S.J. BAKER: That was going to be my next question. Does the Minister know what functions on the ETSA machines can be transferred to E&WS machines, and vice versa; I know it is very difficult?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Whatever the experts advise me can be done.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister keeps failing the test. We are getting close to agreement that the Minister's figures are wrong. I guess that was the exercise—to find out the truth or otherwise of the figures that have been presented. Quite frankly, the figures are fairyland.

I suppose I started using a Tetratics machine back in about 1977. It was one of the first desk tops that the State Government had. It had 25K capacity and, as the Minister said, computers are smaller and more compact. There were whole rooms full of computers in the Government centre and now of course they are far more compact. He is quite correct, although I will say that I have not seen the E&WS computer but I understand it is of significant size.

If we say that we accept they can be put together—and I have some reservations about it—there will be incredible difficulty transferring data from one to another in those areas where somebody may believe that action best suits the Government. I have some difficulties with that. I also have some difficulties in terms of the necessary \$10 million, leaving aside the \$40 million or \$50 million that has already been spent in these areas. That is sunk cost; it is finished. There is no benefit except to run the machines through their useful lifetime, as the Minister suggested.

So we then have to look at what extra additional costs are being incurred in the system that would be saved, and again I do not know what the Minister is talking about.

In relation to the employees, we return to the fact that there are 153 people, presumably, in the new computer area of ETSA at No. 1 Anzac Highway. And they had a devil of a job sorting that problem out, as the Minister would be well aware. They had a terrible problem with the air-conditioning and a number of other aspects, as I understand it.

We are saying that 153 people are necessary now; in E&WS there are currently 56; and suddenly we will continue running the same machines but reduce the work force to 107. That indicates to me—and I will say this again—that either there are currently in ETSA about 70 people more than are necessary, or the figures are crook. I have drawn my own conclusion that the figures are crook.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will have to respond without having a question before me. It is more an accusation that the 'figures are crook'. On the one side in this debate we have an Opposition that basically says, 'We don't actually know much about this area, but we think the figures are crook.'

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: No, the member has it wrong again. The situation is that on one side we have an Opposition that says, 'We actually don't know much about this area, but we think the figures are wrong.' On the other side of the equation we have managers who have been asked to nominate what savings can be made and who have been told that once they have nominated those savings it is their job to produce them. External consultants have gone over those figures, quizzed those managers, looked at the situation and have come down with figures like \$70 million worth of savings.

Mr D.S. Baker: On your shonky figures.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The member for Victoria is accusing the consultants of being too stupid to know that they are being fooled.

Mr D.S. Baker: No, I am accusing them of listening to your shonky figures.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Again, the member is making the assumption that I produced those figures. They were not produced by me; they were produced by the people in the two organisations. If it has taken the member this long to realise that, then one really does need to wonder about his capacity to deal with facts. But the situation really is that these figures were produced by the managers who have to perform to those figures. These figures are at the total bottom end of what these people think are absolutely certain to be produced. Indeed, the consultants tell us that there will be \$16 million worth of savings in the first year of operations.

If one has an Opposition that says, 'We don't actually believe it,' for spurious reasons, without backing it up, and on the other hand one has the managers who deal with it, and the consultants who have looked at it, both coming to roughly the same conclusion, then I know whom I would believe.

To finish up with the Deputy Leader's problem with regard to the numbers: what we have is 50-odd people in one organisation and a much larger number in another organisation. If we have a single organisation, what sort of numbers do we need? It turns out that in this case we believe that roughly twice the number of those in the smaller organisation is sufficient to do the job for that single large organisation once it has been merged. This is quite a pointless exercise. If the Opposition is merely going to say, 'We have seen this figure, but we don't believe it,' then what is the point of arguing?

We have experts and a consultant, both looking at it and both coming to roughly the same conclusion. I do not care how often the Opposition says, 'We don't understand it; we don't trust it. Therefore you must be wrong.' That is a spurious argument and a strange one to have to deal with.

Mr MATTHEW: I would like to continue where the Deputy Leader left off in relation to the area of information technology. I would like to start by quoting an article that appeared in *Pacific Computer Weekly* on 2 July 1993. For the benefit of members, this journal is recognised as an Australian computer periodical. It is written by people with specialised knowledge in the area of computing and it is circulated widely through the computing industry. The article I wish to refer to as the basis of my question states:

Hans Salzman, the transition team leader in charge of reviewing the IT aspect of the proposed amalgamation, has indicated that it will result in savings despite the E&WS's plan to spend an extra \$20 million, and without removing any major hardware components.

One Government observer claims that most applications which are required are already running on ETSA's equipment. 'Why spend another \$20 million when the systems are already in place?' he

asked. The Tandem system won't be ready for two years. The Government wants to save money and it does not make logical sense from an IT point of view.

The article also points out:

The controversy follows another which arose from the Government's decision to name Tandem Computers prime contractor to the E&WS in a deal believed to be worth \$38 million.

That \$38 million worries me. We have a situation where experts in the industry are raising serious questions, claiming that the Government wishes to spend a further \$20 million on a computer system where one is already in existence. It seems to centre on a \$38 million contract. Can the Minister confirm this figure? Will \$20 million be spent, and can he confirm that the contract with Tandem is for \$38 million?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I can certainly confirm that the Tandem contract is of the order of \$38 million or \$39 million; that much I can confirm. The figure of \$20 million that the honourable member has just put to me, I will need to check.

I accept that the honourable member has some degree of skill and some knowledge of the computer industry that is far in excess of that of almost everyone else in this House, because he has worked in that area. I will not mention where he has worked because he then becomes subject to abuse from the member for Victoria. However, in any case, it may be a reasonable thing for him to be briefed by the people in charge of the computer area so that he can check for himself.

I believe that he has a reputation to maintain in the computer field and that he would therefore look at these things without prejudice, because his professional pride would be invoked in this situation. So, I am perfectly happy to make people available to speak to him about the computer savings, and he might then be able to brief the Liberal Party about the situation.

Mr MATTHEW: I would be happy to accept the Minister's offer, provided, of course, that it does not preclude those same people from appearing before the select committee. Of course, that is where important questions need to be asked in another place. I am surprised that the Minister does not know whether or not that \$20 million figure is accurate. An amount of that magnitude I would have hoped the Minister would certainly have had off the top of his head in a debate of this significance.

That aside, I would like to refer to a further article that appeared in the same periodical to which I referred previously, namely, *Pacific Computer Weekly*. On this occasion it was an article dated 6 August, for indeed this periodical has taken considerable interest in the computing situation in this amalgamation. The article states:

Further criticism has been levelled at the South Australian Government's amalgamation of its utilities with some industry observers now suggesting there is also potential for huge savings in communication costs, but this they say, too, has been ignored by the Government.

That is the first point: the industry is saying that communication cost savings are possible, but the Government has ignored the options available to it for that. The reason they have been is detailed as follows:

Observers now claim that the E&WS looks like continuing to develop its own network, despite claims that it would be more cost effective for ETSA's network to be used by both utilities after amalgamation.

The problem, according to one observer, is that a \$38 million Tandem contract with E&WS is performance-based and Tandem has to guarantee the performance of the hardware going in. If it cannot do that, the E&WS cannot authorise any more equipment. If E&WS were to use the ETSA network and the Tandem system did not meet its response times Tandem could then blame any problems on the network.

'Tandem won't guarantee performance on the X.25 packet switching network,' the observer said.

I find that a fairly alarming revelation because here we are looking at a Bill that is supposed to be saving the taxpayer a considerable amount of money and now we have experts in the industry saying that the Government is doing the exact reverse, because they are not grasping the network that they already have in place but are going to develop another one, and the reason is that the Government is locked into a \$38 million contract. Not to use the network to be developed as part of that contract will mean that Tandem, the supplier in this case, will not guarantee the performance of the network. That obviously poses the question: what flexibility does the Government have with this \$38 million contract? If they were to bail out what would it cost them? Would that cost actually be lesser than the potential money they risk losing by not using the existing ETSA network?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are a number of interesting points in that and I will go through them. The first is that the honourable member believes that more savings are possible rather than less savings—and that is an interesting situation. The further point the honourable member makes, that for some reason or other he has been able to show that there are costs associated with running two separate organisations, would seem to me to be a very good argument for merging them so that in the future we can avoid those sorts of costs. The third point that the honourable member raises, that there are retrospective costs involved with the fact that the contract between E&WS and Tandem was signed over a year ago prior to the two organisations even being put under one portfolio area, is somehow or other indicative of the fact that we have failed to pick up retrospective savings.

It is quite simple: when you get two organisations both going their own ways then they will produce systems of their own that suit them, for whatever reasons. If you then try to combine those then there will be savings once you get out of using that equipment that each of them have, and that is in fact what we are trying to do: to say that there are savings achievable. Some of those will be achievable early in the piece and others will not be achievable until much later when the current equipment has run its course.

Mr MATTHEW: The Minister's response disappoints me. The fact is that you do not need to amalgamate utilities to generate savings in computing costs. Perhaps I ought to give the Minister a very simple example. I heard recently on ABC Radio Mr Hans Salzmann, the department's systems expert, talking about potential savings and the journalist on that occasion, Keith Conlon, said to Mr Salzmann 'Name one saving that will occur in your area of expertise out of this amalgamation,' and Mr Salzmann's response was something like this: that both ETSA and E&WS were about to embark on purchasing their own fleet vehicle management system and that they would run those systems on separate computers to control their passenger and other vehicles but that now because the amalgamation is going to occur they would have one system on one computer and that therefore there was a cost saving.

That answer horrified me, because in 1988 the Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee put forward a paper on Government fleet vehicle management. That committee was fairly scathing in its report on the way in which Government managed its vehicles, and recommended at the end of the day that the only way to control vehicles adequately was to have one computer, one system, for all of State Government. So savings of that nature can be achieved without amalgamating

departments. They are just plain commonsense. This Government has spent \$300 million per annum on computing, and in a confidential submission from the Premier and his Minister for Business and Regional Development to the Cabinet on 22 March this year they admitted that they had blown information technology. They are about to do it again.

We have a situation where an amalgamation of two computer systems is occurring. That can offer benefits, but only if the right decisions are made, and the experts are saying that the right decision to be made in the area of communications is not to pick up the Tandem network but to pick up the existing ETSA network. In fact, some experts have gone further. I am aware that Cray Communications submitted to Government that it had an opportunity to use the ETSA network for all Government communications right across the entire State, and this Government ignored it—and it is not the only company to make that recommendation.

So what I am talking about is a top level approach. This Government seems intent on saying, 'We have problems, we have to save money, let's grab a couple of departments and amalgamate them and see if we can do it,' without looking at the whole picture, and they are going to blow more money. The experts are saying that. I am quoting their word here, and they are saying that the Government has made the wrong decision. The savings are not there. In fact, it is going to cost money, Minister. So, I ask the Minister: will he look at the situation again and see whether it is possible to do something about this Tandem contract, and use the existing ETSA network if indeed it can be properly demonstrated—and I am relying on the word of network experts here—that it is a cheaper way to go? That is surely in the interests of taxpayers. It must be looked at in the picture of total Government and not just in the context of the amalgamation of two utilities.

Before I sit down, I should say that the Liberal Party did speak to Tandem before the signing of this contract. In fact, my colleague the shadow Minister responsible for the E&WS, the member for Heysen, and I met with representatives of Tandem. They briefed us and we both expressed concerns on that occasion about the magnitude of this particular contract, because the \$38 million contract was recognised by the industry at the time as being excessive. So, I come back to my point: can the Minister review this contract with Tandem and look at using the ETSA communication facility, because the experts tell us that this is the cheapest way to go, that this is where we will make savings? The other way will cost taxpayers money.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The Tandem contract was signed, as I said, in June of 1992. That means that we have a contractual obligation, and that obligation was entered into correctly at the time, because the E&WS was on its own as a single organisation, was looking around for the best way to fulfil its requirements, and it signed up with Tandem. For whatever reasons it did at the time I do not know as I was not the Minister, but I can imagine that the experts in E&WS would have looked around in the normal standard way that they do and would have settled on Tandem as being the appropriate contractor. The contract having been signed, it has to be honoured, because obviously there are remedies available for people when you break a contract.

From the time we put the E&WS and ETSA under the same Minister the situation arose that there was the possibility of a merger, which was looked at and was found to be a reasonable one with major savings. That means that we have two separate systems in place. There is nothing that I can do

about it. I cannot say that, after a contract has been signed and because we have taken other actions, we can now go back to the contractor and say, 'Look, fellas, we've changed our minds. We have to unwind all that.'

Mr Matthew: You shouldn't have signed it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I should not have signed it? First, I was not the Minister; secondly, the organisation had not come under my portfolio; and, thirdly, the thought of a merger had not occurred at that stage, and the honourable member says we should not have signed the contract. The honourable member says that he had misgivings after he and the member for Heysen were briefed by the Tandem people. Were those misgivings transmitted to the then Minister?

Mr Matthew: They most certainly were.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will certainly check the import of that concern of the honourable member.

Mr Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am sure that, if the honourable member says in this House that he did so, it will be capable of being found. But the situation still is that the experts advising the Minister of the day indicated that a particular course of action was the best way to go.

The situation that we get from members opposite is that, by and large, they criticise everything. It is not as if they criticise some things and give praise in other places: they criticise everything. What they have not realised is that that devalues their criticism. If you criticise everything that comes up, people will not know when to believe you and when not to believe you, because they know that you are criticising for the sake of criticism. If the honourable member had a genuine criticism that got lost in the general situation of the carping that goes on normally in the Opposition, I am sorry if that happened, but it happened.

The experts advised the Minister of the day, and the Minister of the day made that decision. The Minister of the day is not a computer expert. She has to take the advice of the people in her department. If members opposite ever get into Government, it will be fascinating to see whether they disagree with all the information they get from their departmental heads, because that will make a very entertaining form of Government. It is a pity I will not be around to see it!

Mr D.S. BAKER: I noted with interest that today it was announced in another place that a select committee will be set up to inquire into the ETSA and E&WS merger. It seems right and proper for the Minister, who seems to be the fount of all knowledge in the workings of E&WS and ETSA, to throw himself before that committee so that he can be questioned, because obviously we do not have the ability in the time available and under the Standing Orders to question him and the officers of his department in detail about these savings.

I want an assurance from the Minister that he is prepared to go before that committee to answer these questions on the amalgamation and to be cross-questioned on the benefits to the taxpayers of South Australia, not only on information technology, which all the experts have told us will cost masses of taxpayers' dollars and there will be no savings. In fact, the Opposition's and my expert says that the increased costs will be some \$68 million. Can I have an assurance from the Minister that he will make himself and his officers available before that committee to be cross-questioned on the figures he has given us this evening?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is very clear that the member for Victoria does not understand the Westminster system. In the Westminster system—

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In the Westminster system, the Minister is not supposed to be the expert in charge of given areas. That is the whole intent of having members elected to the Parliament and then chosen by their dominant group in Parliament to become Ministers. It is to avoid having the experts on top but to have them on tap instead. Under those circumstances, it is the experts that ought to be the people who appear before the select committee. I have never pretended that I put these figures together. I have never pretended that I am the person who is the fount of all wisdom for the department. To do so would be utterly stupid. I would hope that I am not that, but in any case I will make whatever experts are necessary, the people who are under my control in the agencies, available for the select committee.

I will want to expedite the workings of that select committee so that the people in another place who have not made the same decision as members in this place, namely, to oppose at all costs, will have a chance to get expert views and expert opinions so that they can actually make up their minds.

I think that the Democrats in another place have indicated that they are willing to make up their mind on the basis of evidence rather than prejudice, which I am afraid is what is happening here with an Opposition that made up its mind to oppose this measure well before it asked for any information. I will make those people available, but it would set a very unreasonable precedent if a Minister in one place appeared before a select committee in another place, and I have no intention of doing that.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I gather from that response that the Minister is refusing to appear before the select committee that is inquiring into the amalgamation of the E&WS and ETSA.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There is no select committee at the moment, so the whole thing is hypothetical.

Mr D.S. Baker: Are you refusing?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I suggest that the honourable member read *Hansard*.

Mr D.S. Baker: Are you refusing?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Does the member for Victoria want to ask a question?

Mr D.S. BAKER: I want to affirm that the Minister, if required, is refusing to appear before the select committee in another place in order to be cross-questioned on the amalgamation of E&WS and ETSA.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member must be either hard of hearing or unable to deal with the information that goes in through his ears to wherever it goes.

An honourable member: Or both.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Or both, as the honourable member says. I have said that I will provide to the select committee those people who have expertise. I have also said that I am not one of those people; therefore, that would not assist the select committee.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member thinks that one should be an engineer. The whole situation is rather ludicrous.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Members of the Opposition have reached a level of ludicrousness that is remarkable. They say that the moment they become a Minister they will be expert in every area.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I do not pretend to be an expert in any of those areas; and I was not elected to this Parliament to be an expert.

Mr S.J. BAKER: What we have seen tonight is an indication of the absolute farce of this Bill. We have had admissions from the Minister about contracts. We have heard from someone who knows a little more about computers than most people in this place. It is quite clear that there will not be a saving of \$10 million a year; there will be a cost impost of enormous proportions, even if it is only \$20 million, but we have been told that \$68 million will be the total turnover. One of the most fundamental figures is \$16 million—

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: The member for Stuart should listen. The perceived saving is \$16 million, which is more than one quarter of the total savings outlined in the document. This is the seventh or the eighth test that this document has failed because not only will there be no savings: there will be significant additional costs.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

Mr S.J. BAKER: Well, the Minister himself has admitted that.

Mrs Hutchison interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr S.J. BAKER: Every time we have questioned information in this document we have found it basically flawed. As the Minister says, he is not an expert, and we understand that, but at least he should understand the figures that he presents to this Committee, or not present them at all. He should not hide behind consultants who have been given doctored information provided by his so-called experts, the same experts who made the decision to buy a \$38 million Tandem computer. I cannot comment on that but others have.

I turn now to the other large item. As I said, the original intention was to go through this document figure by figure, but that is no longer appropriate for a whole range of reasons. I will ask one more question regarding the savings document, given that every time we have asked a question the Minister has failed to convince the Committee and to explain. I refer to supply, the other large item in the savings document. We are talking about a conceivable saving of 2 per cent on total value from running a better supply system.

When I was shadow Minister responsible for industrial relations I visited many factories in Adelaide and talked to managers about the changes in the management of their organisations. The emerging trend was just in time (JIT), and that was combined with the concept of quality management and then total quality management (TQM), so now we have JIT as a subset of TQM.

Manufacturers said that, provided they could guarantee supply lines, they could reduce stock to a minimum, and significant yearly costs were associated with those minimal stocks. Manufacturers determined the level of risk associated with a strike in a particular factory, which would delay inputs to the factory, and found significant savings on holding costs. Every time they have \$100 of stock sitting in a factory for a year, they incur the opportunity costs of that stock or the cost of borrowing the money to hold it, and that could be \$10.

They found with better stock management they were able to save between 5 per cent and 20 per cent of their holding costs. When we talk of millions of dollars, the cost savings are significant, and this document suggests a \$6 million saving. I do not dispute that there is a \$6 million saving, but I argue that we could already save that in the existing

organisations as they stand today. We are not talking about common pieces of equipment, unless the Minister is going to pipe the electricity and wire the water to the consumers.

We are not talking about common elements—the nuts, bolts, wire and concrete are all different. So the stores are different according to the function to be performed. There might be one or two common elements, but basically 95 per cent of the equipment used is different. Therefore, we have savings elsewhere on depots, but we leave them out of the system. If a 'just in time' process is already in place and the savings amount to 2 per cent, those savings could be achieved today. No savings will be achieved by the amalgamation in terms of the supply function.

The Minister may claim there are savings with respect to the depots, but I will deal with them in a moment. I would expect E&WS and ETSA to be operating on best practices and reducing stocks and not holding items that may not be needed for two or three years. They should be holding items that are needed within three or four months at the maximum. In some cases industry needs only one or two weeks's supply if it is located in the Adelaide metropolitan area. That is how the system is supposed to operate.

I suggest that we can achieve magnificent efficiencies simply by making sure we operate effectively and efficiently, given the 'just in time' rules. I do not concede that savings of \$6 million will result from the amalgamation. However, I do concede that savings of \$6 million in both organisations could be achieved just by doing it properly.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member is perfecting the technique of making accusations early in what he says and then going on to say many other things and asking a question at the other end in the hope that I will have forgotten the accusation. We have a major test here for the Opposition, and I can tell the Committee now that the Opposition will fail that test miserably. When the honourable member says that experts in the departments are presenting doctored information, the test is that he should go outside the Chamber and say so. The Deputy Leader should not accuse officers in the departments of presenting doctored information without giving them the chance at law to fight back.

That is the test for the Deputy Leader: when this debate is finished, to make these claims on the steps of Parliament in front of television cameras so that the experts have the opportunity to take him to court and clean him out. I can tell the Committee that the Deputy Leader will not do that. That is a test the Opposition has failed and, as a result, it has exposed some of the weakness in its arguments. Whenever we get to a situation where members feel they are on weak ground, they start making extravagant claims because they know they are making them in Parliament under privilege.

That is the problem the Opposition has. It is a test it must face, and I predict it is a test the Opposition will fail. I think we are starting to get into fairly repetitive territory. I have argued that it is possible to arrive at some savings by continuing to run the two organisations separately. I have used the phrase 'the law of diminishing returns' to indicate that they have already gone a long way towards achieving greater efficiency, and even the honourable member for Victoria acknowledges that.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member has never been sure.

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes, and at the same time the honourable member has been the member for diminishing

intellect. We need to stop this funny quipping to and fro because nobody, and certainly the Parliament, gains from that. There have been savings in each of the organisations in the areas that have been delineated by the honourable member. I have no doubt that they can continue to go a little way in there but, if he looks at page 10 of the strategic savings document, he will find under 'Material and supply' various reasons why it is believed that there will be savings as a result of the merger. In fact, it states:

Improvements are possible, restructuring and redesigning the supply chain from consumer to external supplier to eliminate duplication in common services and to use common contracts.

Page 13 of the Ernst and Young document also indicates some of the sums of money that are there in terms of procurement and the fairly small percentages that are necessary

Mr D.S. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member can read it in *Hansard* later. In any case, savings are available and, during my second reading reply, I canvassed the reasons why I believe that parallel savings are not the major way to go, and why you cannot achieve major savings through parallel savings but you can by merging. If we have to go over all this ground again, it will become very repetitive.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I pick up an earlier point about the documents being doctored. One would have to assume that someone has doctored the documents, and the experts may well be the Minister's own staff, or they may well be experts at doctoring documents. We have already seen the \$30 million become \$111 million and now it has gone back to \$56 million. Every item we have questioned has been flawed. The ludicrous situation with information technology was that there were no savings but increased costs. Someone seems to have been having a go at the system to guarantee and justify the changes taking place. If the Minister cannot answer the questions, I am sure the people who have the expertise on the ground floor can supply the answers.

We have received telephone calls from the people in ETSA and the E&WS who are the experts, and we have been told that the document is flawed, that it has been put together at an upper level to prove that the Minister can achieve savings. We are receiving those sorts of telephone calls from people who are on the ground floor. If the Minister thinks that my telephone has not been ringing, he has another think coming. I have people ringing me from both organisations. I have widely distributed the Minister's savings document in the hope that everybody will have a good look at it. The feedback I am getting is quite clear: 'What donkey put this document together? Who dreamt up this sort of saving?' Of course, some of them will be trying to protect their patch. If somebody rings up and says, 'Look Mr Baker, we think there is something wrong with that figure', they could well be protecting their own territory. They do not want to be laid off because there are some staff savings associated with that.

I have had some reasonably intelligent conversations with some very intelligent people who are far more expert than I in these things. I do not understand some of the things that they tell me because they are technical, so I have asked them to tell me what it means in dollars and cents. It is clear that from their point of view the savings are not achievable. I should like to make it clear that it is not just me firing a bullet through the document. I think the Minister would understand that from some of our questions, because they have been raised by people ringing us and saying, 'Hang on, we have got hold of that document, and we do not believe that this is

possible for these reasons.' The Minister will understand that some of the questions relate not just to the document or its merits, but to the further information that has been supplied.

In terms of the supply function, at this stage we have a difference of opinion. We have had the same problem in debating the whole measure. Ultimately the proof of the pudding will come out when every person responsible for these areas is called before the select committee and asked to explain what they are doing now, how they can do it better and how an amalgamation can assist in work performance and achievable efficiencies. Again, I have a great difference of opinion with the Minister. I am ready to concede savings of \$1 million, but I cannot concede the rest because of the processes that should be followed to ensure that we are talking about what is possible at the margin. This is the problem with the document, about which I will ask one more question: will the Minister outline every depot that he intends to close?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I need to pick up the honourable member on some of the comments that he has made. He is desperately trying to establish that the savings went from \$30 million to \$111 million and back to \$50 million and so on. That simply is not true. Throughout this whole debate and all the things that led to it we have said that when the situation was gone through on separate occasions the minimum figures increased each time. As I indicated in my second reading explanation, one of the things that gave me some degree of comfort was the fact that every time people looked at the same area in greater detail, they believed that the savings would be higher rather than lower. For the honourable member to throw in the \$111 million as something that the Government is desperately trying to achieve is wrong.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member now says that I should not have mentioned the \$111 million in the first instance. I was trying to provide the Parliament with the information that the \$50 million with which I came out was at the bottom end of the range. I also indicated that the bottom end of the range was what the Government would be aiming at. If there is more, that is fine, but we were aiming only for the \$50 million at the bottom end.

I have no comment to make with regard to the honourable member's telephone, despite his invitation to me to do so. I know that whenever one wants to make major changes people will feel uncomfortable and will try to find reasons not to make them. It is an established thing and totally understandable; nobody likes having changes. However, I cannot accept the honourable member's accusation that they are afraid of being laid off, because that is Liberal territory. Time and again we have said, and we mean it, that we will not dismiss people. In fact, we will allow people to go if they wish to do so and, if not, they do not have to go. VSPs and TSPs are the way that we go.

With regard to the naming of the depots, I have a tentative list that people have worked through, but I am not prepared to release it at this stage. The select committee can ask for it, because it is important. As I said yesterday, if we try to specify the outcomes too closely, we take away the dynamics and the flexibility of trying to get to those outcomes.

It is reasonable that the people in the organisation have a degree of flexibility to work through those things in order to make sure that they can do so, with consultation with the people involved, so that the people in those areas do not all of a sudden read in the paper what has happened to them. It

is reasonable that they should be allowed to have an input into the system, and we cannot have an input by people into the system if we make the announcements beforehand. It is unreasonable to do so, and I would not wish to do so. I am quite sure that, in a few weeks, or whatever timeframe the select committee uses, the two agencies concerned will have worked through that with the people involved and will be in a position to give that information at a later date.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I represent a South-Eastern electorate which could be marginal. I have had some representation from my people at Beachport where there is an E&WS office. Will the Minister comment on the worthiness of that office?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: In each of the situations where you have two separate organisations they have determined, through historical and other reasons, that they should have a certain presence in certain country towns. One of the things that I would like members opposite to take into consideration is this: a number of members opposite have expressed support for a process of the two organisations staying separate and the two organisations continuing with a reduction, with a greater efficiency, which in fact translates into a reduction of numbers. Therefore, if each organisation stays separate and is required to go down that path, then it will reduce presences in certain areas.

Now, it seems to me that, if a country town had a merged situation where it had only one presence and that presence might have been withdrawn by the organisation that had the presence in that country town, it would be far better for a merged situation to ensure that both presences are available in that town, rather than it being withdrawn.

Mr D.S. Baker: What if the town misses out? That's a stupid argument.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member obviously has not understood the arguments, because if ETSA stayed on its own and reduced its presence in a town or took away that particular office, depot or whatever it had in that town, then the town would also miss out. If E&WS stayed separate, then that town would also miss out. If they both withdrew, I can foresee the possibility that you might have a situation in a town where you had both the E&WS and ETSA present and each of those would not be quite sufficient to maintain independent presences by those two organisations. If they merged, then there could well be a situation where a merged presence might be possible in that town, whereas if there was not a merged presence both the individual offices would be withdrawn. So, in some ways I think that a merged organisation will be less harsh on the country towns that members opposite represent.

Mrs Hutchison: And this side.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: And, indeed, some members on this side represent. But it is a situation where the merger may well be more favourable to country towns than if the two separate organisations continued on their individual paths to greater efficiency.

Mr D.S. BAKER: Obviously the people at Beachport have a problem, but that was a bad example. If the Minister cannot tell me what is going on at Beachport, can he say what will happen under this merger to my good people at Bordertown, which is in my electorate as well? The people of Bordertown are worried, because they have an E&WS district office and an ETSA district office.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I thought that I indicated in an answer to an earlier question that I did not want to give that information, and I appreciate the fact that the member for Victoria can have a great deal of fun going back and saying,

'The Minister refused to answer the question as to whether or not you will be closed down,' and he will thoroughly enjoy himself. He may even be able to hold off a National Party challenge in this marginal seat of his. The situation is that we should not affect people's lives without allowing them to have an input into the process.

People in the two areas he has mentioned, Beachport and Bordertown, have not had a chance to have an input into the process and it is utterly essential that they do. So the honourable member can go on for the next four or five hours if he likes and ask me questions about all the presences in all the other towns in his electorate, but the answer will be the same as I gave a couple of questions ago.

Mr D.S. BAKER: The picture is starting to emerge a bit now. My good people at Kalangadoo have only an E&WS office. Under this new amalgamation, would it be possible to have an ETSA office there? Would those things be possible under this new merger arrangement?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will give the honourable member credit; that is a reasonable question. I think that in the medium to long term any town that currently has a single presence which is not removed will end up with a double presence. Clearly the whole intent of this situation is to ensure that both the E&WS and ETSA are represented in each of the areas, whether they are city or country, where a presence is deemed to be necessary to remain.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I gather from that that regarding those towns in my electorate that have only an E&WS or an ETSA office, with adequate and strong representation from their local member, they will possibly have the presence of both under the merged organisation? So there is a fair chance that with appropriate representation those towns with only one office will have both. Can I have that assurance from the Minister?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I appreciate that the honourable member and indeed all members would strongly want to represent their particular constituencies, but we cannot make a decision on the basis of whether a particular member got an eight out of 10 for representation or only a four out of 10 for representation. The decisions will be made on a somewhat more objective basis than that. The situation is that in the longer term, where there are presences in country towns, there will be presences of both E&WS and ETSA.

Mr D.S. BAKER: I am worried about my Naracoorte people, because that is another strong area within my electorate. Naracoorte is unique because it has an E&WS district office but it is the area headquarters for ETSA. Can the Minister assure me that its being area headquarters will not prejudice representation of both, because that is important for my people at Naracoorte?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have already indicated what the situation is and I think that the honourable member ought to put a question like that on notice so that when the information is finally provided, after consultation with the people in all these areas through the select committee, he will be able to get his answer. If he wants to put the rest of the towns that he represents on the record, we can take all that in one lump. I think the honourable member understands what I am saying. Presumably, he is trying to get something together for the local papers in those country towns. I do not begrudge him that. I think we need to protect the honourable member from the ravages of all those National Party candidates who are otherwise likely to take his marginal seat away from him.

Mr VENNING: I want to go in to bat strongly for the E&WS and ETSA depots scattered throughout the Mid North. In some areas we have very modern, efficient facilities. I refer first to the almost brand new facility at Crystal Brook. The Minister is probably aware that Crystal Brook has been the site of the northern E&WS depot for many years, at one stage employing over 300 people—and it still employs more than 150. The community is very concerned, from the district council level down, about the future of the depot at Crystal Brook, because its closure would have a huge effect on the infrastructure of the town. Can the Minister give me or my constituents any guarantees or any hope that the depot will remain? Secondly, if he was considering closing it, would he have a community impact study undertaken and what would be the effect on the community of Crystal Brook?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The situation is becoming a little peculiar. The honourable member knows full well that, if I were to give him any assurances regarding any particular town or any particular depot or any particular office, whether city or country, within minutes all 47 members would be in here determined to ask and to get the same privilege as the member for Custance. I have indicated that I cannot and I am not prepared to do that at this stage, because it is necessary for people to be consulted before any changes are made. If the honourable member does not believe that, I presume it is his right to say, 'I want an answer now', but we ought to be talking to people before we make those kinds of decisions. So that is the process that will be gone through, and I am sorry if I cannot answer the honourable member's question for the moment, but it will all become clear in due course.

Mr VENNING: I want to continue the line of my questioning. I hope the Minister can understand the frustration not only of the local member for the area but of those people who have jobs and who are very concerned at this moment about what the future holds for them. There are hundreds of people. I know the candidate up there, Rob Kerin, is continually telling me—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are in Committee and we are referring to clause 13. The honourable member is making remarks that he should have made during his second reading speech. This is not a second reading speech: this is the Committee stage, and he should confine his remarks to clause 13 and the proposition before us.

Mr S.J. BAKER: Mr Chairman, we are talking about depot closures: they are part of the costings document and they are part of the functional statement, which is endemic to clause 13, and I believe it appropriate that the honourable member should pursue the line of questioning that we have been pursuing during this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: It sounds very much like a second reading speech to me and it is getting close to the stage of being farcical. The member for Custance.

Mr VENNING: I am very disappointed with those remarks—absolutely. There is no doubt, as many people know, that I am here to represent my people. If the depot closes, it affects everybody. Yes, I made these comments in my second reading speech and now is the relevant time—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have no argument with the honourable member representing his constituency, but there is a time and a place to do that, and the time and the place should have been in the second reading stage, not in Committee. The honourable member is making a farce of the Committee. The member for Custance.

Mr VENNING: I will keep my comments to a question. In relation to the closure of these depots, I also refer to the

ETSA depot in Clare which, as the Minister knows, is a large facility. If that depot was to stay in Clare, would Crystal Brook lose? I also refer to the ETSA depot in Port Pirie. The Minister said he will not be able to give us any answers, but when can I tell my constituents we will have the answers to these problems?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We have the situation where changes are being made—at least this Bill envisages that changes will be made. When changes are made, people will feel uncomfortable, and that is a fact of life: there is nothing we can do about it. But we do have a degree of comfort in this situation that may not exist in other States, or indeed if the honourable member's Party were lucky enough to fall into government. That degree of comfort that I am speaking about is that no person need fear for their job. Their job is guaranteed and the only way people will leave those jobs is voluntarily, by either taking a voluntary separation package or a targeted separation package. So the honourable member can assure all the people in all the towns that he represents, as indeed all other members can do for all the towns they represent—and the members who have electorates in the cities can do the same—that nobody will be without a job without their agreeing that they no longer need that job and they prefer to take a package.

Mr VENNING: In relation to closing these depots—and obviously there will be a shuffle of the infrastructure—will the workers from both E&WS and ETSA be treated equally?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We need a presence of E&WS people in the country and in the city, and we need the presence of the same front-line kind of people from ETSA in the country and in the city. So obviously we will have to treat them equally.

Mr VENNING: It is obvious that the depots will close and that many communities will be greatly affected by what will happen. Will the Minister give an assurance or a guarantee that, before closures are implemented and these communities are greatly affected, community impact studies will be undertaken?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I have given an undertaking that there will be consultation with the people involved. That is the job of the statutory authority; that is what has been happening traditionally in ETSA as a statutory authority. When we get a statutory authority called Southern Power and Water that will again happen. There will be consultation with the people before we make any decisions. That is basically all we can say.

When you have people who are going to be affected by it you need to consult them. However, again, we have that absolute saver for them: that none of them need to lose their jobs if they do not wish to. In fact, if no-one decides to take a package in a town there will not be a closure or a loss of jobs in that town.

Mr VENNING: We know that this Bill will pass in a few days. The Minister should have a pretty fair idea when the Bill will become law. He must have some idea of when the rationalisation of these depots will take place. I am asking for a date within one month or two months of the likely date. Is it likely to be before Christmas?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: If I knew that the Bill was going straight from here to another place and that the Bill would be debated there and passed, I would be in a position to give the honourable member some time line. But, as I understand it, when this Bill gets to another place there may well be a select committee. If there is a select committee then control over how long the Bill will take to go through the two

Houses is something that will be very much in the hands of the select committee and, indeed, will depend on whether or not it meets the deadline that we have in the parliamentary situation. If they do not produce a favourable response in order for the Bill to get into another place by, say, mid-November, there will be some difficulty in the normal interchange between the Houses for the Bill to become law before we rise for the Christmas break. So, I am really not in a position to give the honourable member any indication of the time line, because to some extent that will be out of my hands.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I would like to impart some knowledge to the Committee on what is actually happening at the moment. One of my colleagues, the member for Murray-Mallee, has provided me with some correspondence about the regional manager telling the depots to save 6.6 per cent. That is the saving to be achieved in 1992-93. Indeed, as I understand it, two engineers are still travelling each day from Adelaide to Murray bridge in separate departmental vehicles. That is just to meet the need, because they are cutting at one end and having to top up at another.

We have a number of pieces of correspondence from people who are worried about their jobs. We have a very personal letter from an individual who is employed by the E&WS. I will not give sufficient details to identify him, but his letter states:

I believe the majority of E&WS employees are dissatisfied with what is happening at present but are reluctant to speak out for fear of being perhaps victimised.

This person does not have a job and he must find a new station. If you close the depot they have nowhere to go and are in a no-win situation. Is the Minister going to say, 'We will find you a job in Adelaide or the Northern Territory or Victoria,' because it simply does not compute. I have others here who talk about the time response now because of the decrease in employees.

I have some more information about the diminution in services as a result of changes already being made within the department and the response times being affected. I have another one about when a meeting was held with the merger team and when questions were asked of the merger team about the future of particular depots. They asked questions about the impact of these mergers, but no details were provided.

The one thing they all received was a document relating to which was the best logo for Southern Power and Water—something that I find quite fascinating. These employees were asked to fill out the sheet and tick the right box but, when it came to talking about their futures, management was not particularly interested in speaking to them. I ask Government members to contemplate that.

A number of letters have been written to the editors of country papers. I note that the following letter was written to employees on 20 July 1993:

The Government has decided to merge our two organisations. We are proceeding accordingly.

That means that the thing is in process and the Government does not really care whether it passes or fails; it is going headlong into that position. So, what we are seeing, irrespective of how the select committee progresses, is that decisions are being made which may not necessarily be in the best interests of people because it may well not succeed.

The Bill may well fail when we see these cost savings put under the microscope, as someone must still come up with the goods. If people do not come up with the goods then, of

course, the merger will fail. Yet people's lives are being affected in the interim.

I have a number of comments about the merger documents that have been sent out—observations made by people in the area and particularly people who are being affected. That came from just from one of my colleagues, the member for Murray Mallee, and he is talking about the human problems: people not knowing where their jobs are, people who do not have jobs at the moment and who must find a regional office or depot somewhere to get a job. That is part and parcel of the problem.

I will leave the savings document because I do not need to say much more about it. The Minister did not succeed on any one of the tests, and I did say at the beginning that if he got the first one right the rest would become far easier. He did not get the first one right, and he failed all the rest. So, at this stage there may well be one or two items in this document which are quite correct. I am willing to say that there are one, two, three or four assessments that are indeed valid. However, the ones I have tested have failed and therefore the document really is not worth the paper on which it is printed. It is a function of the material that was supplied to the consultants and everybody would recognise that there is a disclaimer at the end of the document because from the timeframe and information provided it is quite clear that Ernst and Young have prepared this report and based their opinions on information and assumptions provided to it by the client, ETSA and E&WS.

I will leave that document, which will come back to haunt the Minister, in whatever capacity, whether it be on the Opposition benches or outside the Parliament. I am sure that it will come back to haunt him. I would like to talk about industrial relations briefly. Having determined unequivocally that the savings document is so flawed that it has no capacity to deliver the savings that have been indicated, I will now refer to other items in the Bill.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr S.J. BAKER: In relation to industrial relations, we are told that there are 19 awards. Can the Minister confirm that Mr Polites came over from Canberra to advise the merger committee on the status of the awards and the extent and ease with which these awards could be combined? My understanding is that Mr Polites arrived in Adelaide, went and had a look at the State and Federal awards, and said that we are facing one of the most difficult amalgamations that he had ever come across. My understanding is also that Mr Polites advised that it would take three or four years in which to satisfy all members who would be involved. I have also been advised from another source that the ultimate impact of combining separate awards under separate jurisdictions—and remembering that the employees will not go to the lowest common denominator; they will go to the highest common denominator—will cost the E&WS-ETSA a total of about \$20 million a year.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The honourable member again has covered a number of different matters, and I will try to respond to as many of those as I can. His argument that E&WS is cutting at one end and then having to top up at the other end may well be a specific individual example that the

honourable member can bring forward, but he has to recognise that there has been a major reduction in numbers, so that is certainly not something on which he ought to be able to base a major case. Again, Sir, for those people who fear for their jobs: no-one needs to fear being out of a job. This is voluntary separation.

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: The point is that, if anybody wishes to avoid that situation, they merely say 'No' when a voluntary separation or a targeted separation package is offered. That is all they have to do: one short word—'No', and then they will not lose their jobs. That is the thing that needs to be got through to people because I am rather afraid that there may be some disinformation floating around on that. With regard to the disclaimer that the honourable member talked about in the Ernst and Young document, he has seen enough of these consultant's documents to know that that disclaimer is a standard one. With regard to his further question about whether Mr Polites came to South Australia, the answer is that, yes, Mr Polites, the Deputy President, and Mr Blair, a Commissioner of the Australian Industrial Commission, did meet with the merger implementation committee, and did indicate to the committee that the combination into a single organisation in terms of industrial relations, with the different awards operating, would be a very large task indeed. He also indicated that, with goodwill on both sides, it was possible to achieve that.

I would balance that against what the honourable member wants to achieve. He wants to keep the two organisations separate but working together and having people from different organisations doing the same task working together. Does he not believe that that will cause major problems? I can assure him that it will. I am prepared to quote from a letter that I have written to all of the unions. I have forgotten the exact date, but it was over a week ago. Part of that letter states:

My previous commitment to maintain existing terms and conditions for current employees will be met. However, if your union wants its members employed in the Engineering and Water Supply Department to be employees of the new corporation rather than made available to the corporation from the date of proclamation of the new Act creating the corporation, then negotiations with respect to the terms and conditions of employment to be applied will have to be conducted on the basis that no additional costs will be incurred by the corporation in employing those employees.

So, people have been put on notice that if they do want to go to that highest common factor, rather than the lowest common factor—and I agree with the honourable member that that will be the situation; that is inescapable—they will have to provide offsets in some form or another so the situation is cost neutral to the corporation.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister for his refreshing honesty about the difficulties involved. We can imagine that it will take some considerable time, so there will be cost penalties in the interim when we have so many people involved in the merger process, and there may be a pay off at the end if what the Minister says is correct. So, we have the potential for a blowout in the wages bill, unless there is some more downsizing or decreases in staff. I do not know how the Minister operates on both fronts. He is saying that those E&WS employees who are coming into the organisation can aspire to an extra \$100 a week on average, or whatever it is that is currently paid to the ETSA employees. However, he says that to allow them to receive this additional money, whatever it may be, they may have to produce the sorts of

efficiencies and effectiveness that he would expect under an enterprise bargaining arrangement.

I am quite happy with enterprise bargaining and the Minister obviously has shown that he is, too. When talking about this area we know, however, that we are not necessarily talking about people who can make that quantum leap, because they have been dealing in different jurisdictions. It may well be that the people we are talking about getting the extra \$100 a week are working just as effectively and just as efficiently as those in ETSA who are getting \$100 a week more. There will be certain circumstances where that does not prevail, but I am sure there are many other circumstances where it does. So, there will be cost penalties. We have been told they could be as high as \$20 million.

Obviously the Minister will refute that argument and say it is cost neutral. If we can finish somewhere in the middle, we could probably say that the cost penalty could well be \$10 million a year. I am actually coming well down from the figure that was provided to me by someone who knew something more about the situation than I do. So I would appreciate the Minister providing that information. Further, can the Minister provide to the Committee the current cost or outstandings on asset maintenance within the E&WS and within ETSA? A report was produced, I think two or three years ago, that suggested that there were outstandings on our pipes and wires, mainly pipes in the case of the E&WS and wires in the case of ETSA, which from both organisations' points of view could approach \$500 million. I do not have a copy of the report available, but I would appreciate the Minister giving us an update as to where the ultimate maintenance cost of the organisations is actually at.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Obviously the figure of \$20 million that the honourable member has raised is one that I would dispute. The information I have been given by my officers is that they believe the most likely figure is of the order of \$6 million, so we have a situation where we have to pick up \$6 million over several years by enterprise bargaining, and I do not believe that that falls outside our capacity to do it. One can only try out these things and see how they go. That is in fact the situation that I cannot walk away from. Some of that is impossible to predict accurately beforehand.

With regard to the asset management situation, if I understand the honourable member correctly, he is probably concerned about what started with the Public Accounts Committee analysis which indicated that if all the Government assets were to continue to depreciate—

Mr Hamilton: You were the Chairman of that committee, weren't you? You did a—

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: As the honourable member reminds me, I chaired that committee. Therefore, I have some knowledge of these facts, but I am having to draw on information that I have not had in my mind for five or six years, so of necessity it will be in somewhat general terms. The Public Accounts Committee indicated that the E&WS infrastructure replacement could well become a problem if all the existing factors were held constant. As it turned out, one of the things that the Public Accounts Committee specifically indicated was that it had not taken into consideration the likely impact of technology and technological solutions that might take place. Of course, there has been significant improvement in that area, particularly as regards sewerage pipes where the life of the lining of a pipe has been extended by a nominal 20 years from 80 to 100 years. In fact, as I understand it, the experts say that the lining is likely to last considerably longer than that.

That has had the effect of decreasing that particularly large part of the infrastructure replacement costs. When I last saw the figures, the money that was made available for asset replacement was pretty well on line with the expected asset maintenance or refurbishment costs, and I think in ETSA the story was pretty much the same. So I do not hold any real fears that we have a deteriorating set of assets. At the moment, it looks as though we are pretty well level with where we should be. Of course, I remind members that there is not an enormous number of places in the world that can say the same. There is a large number of examples of where the deterioration of the asset base has reached the stage where it is now almost impossible to fix in places such as New York, London and various other places around the world.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand that there are such places in the world. I have visited New York and, as the Minister quite rightly points out, the bills there are enormous. They are talking about having to produce a duplicated water supply system for New York. The city is bankrupt; there is tremendous deterioration; bridges are falling down, and they have no money. I am well aware of that. When I came back from America I felt that we had to ensure that our assets were maintained, because once you slacken off the pace trying to catch up is an impossible task. At least in Australia we have done some things properly, and certainly we have for a long time in South Australia.

However, if the Minister can provide the figures, I would appreciate some updated advice from ETSA and the E&WS on the total—not the amortised amount but certainly what is considered to be a reasonable—amount that is necessary for the replacement of water pipes, the fitting of sleeves to sewerage pipes and the replacement of deficient and defective cabling.

I wish to raise a number of issues, but I will turn now to matters of environment and quality. I will spend a little more time on this issue when we come to the Statutes Repeal Act and deal with the Water Resources Act. It appears to me that there are some tremendous problems facing South Australia. Whilst we may have a better capacity to meet our maintenance requirements, the quality of our water, as I understand it from all this scientific information that has been produced, is deteriorating rapidly.

Has the Minister had a report on the extent to which extra capital works will be required to maintain water quality at its current level? I refer to the River Murray and the supplying of a separate catchment system from the one that we have today. We have had far too many examples in recent years of algal blooms and periods when water in our reservoirs is not of a quality that consumers would wish and it is getting progressively worse. Reference has been made to the Mount Lofty management plans and we know that changes in those areas will be slow and not produce the results in the short term that we would wish. Will the Minister explain to the Committee what are the essentials we need to stop the deterioration in the quality of water in our holdings from the River Murray? What do we need to do?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: At the outset I need to say that the EPA Bill picked up a considerable amount of responsibility in this area and, consequently, part of the debate here is the debate that should have taken place during the passage of the EPA Bill through the House. The honourable member is right, because there is pressure on South Australian water supplies both from algal blooms in the Murray-Darling system and from the water quality aspect. We are caught in the terrible situation of having multiple-use

catchments in the Adelaide Hills. I can deal with each of those matters in turn if the honourable member wishes me to do so. We are importing our algal problems in the Murray because they tend to be there as a result of increasing output, both from point source and from general source nutrients going into the river.

As the honourable member will be aware, South Australia has been careful to ensure no point source sewage discharge any more into the River Murray. That is not the same in all cases upstream and outside of the State. I refer to the kinds of things we do through the Murray-Darling Commission by direct contact, including approaching the people at Albury when they were in the process of considering what kind of effluent treatment and disposal plant they would provide. The steps that need to be taken in this area are being taken because the cleaner the water that comes into the State the easier it is to deal with.

Multiple catchment use in the Adelaide Hills is a problem unique to Adelaide, of all the Australian capitals. It means that we have to take steps to protect the run-off to the best of our ability, and steps have been taken to remove piggeries and other activities out of approved planning for the hills. When we get run-off water into the reservoirs, we need to be careful that it does not deteriorate or cause harm and then, of course, we do an enormous amount of water treatment and purification in this city. That has no parallel in other States and to some extent does not need a parallel in other States because their water supply is much cleaner to start with. Yes, there are problems and we are conscious of them. I do not know that our dealing with them will be affected by the passage of this Bill and, to that extent, we are almost outside the debate that should be taking place on the clauses of this Bill.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understand and appreciate the explanation provided by the Minister. I am well aware of some of the challenges that this State faces. So that I can understand what the new organisation will face in terms of future major capital works, I ask the Minister for a recent update of the capital works that must occur in this State in order to sustain the State's water supplies. I am quite happy for that question to be taken on notice and for a response to be provided at a more convenient time. I would like to know what sort of sums we are talking about.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think that the answer to the honourable member's prayers is a lot closer than he thinks, because the five-year forward capital works budget comes out with the State budget. Consequently, a lot of the information with respect to what is intended to be done will be made available at that time.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I thank the Minister, but it may not answer the question. What is in the forward capital works budget may not meet the needs of South Australia. Has the Minister had some more recent research done on this subject? If so, I would ask him to supply me with it, and I am sure the select committee will be interested in seeing it, too. We have already had responses with respect to the administrative arrangements in offices, and I understand the Minister intends to maintain two separate buildings so that everybody is not crammed into the one building. The two buildings are No. 1 Anzac Highway, for which the Government paid \$15 million (and the upgrading took that up to about \$20 million), and the Australis centre, at whatever rent the State Bank may charge. It may well be that the Government will purchase that building to get the State Bank off the hook. What is the cost of maintaining those two separate premises in terms of the

imputed rent for No. 1 Anzac Highway based on the capital cost and the rent for the Australis centre?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I will deal with the last part of the honourable member's question first. Some time ago I sat down with the E&WS Department and went through what can be called, I suppose unkindly, a 'wish list'—a list of projects that the department would dearly like to start if there was enough money. I refute the suggestion that there is inadequate provision in the capital works forward budget for the works that need to be done. There is no reason to fear that the Government is allowing the effort to drop off below a level where it is sustainable. Indeed, as the honourable member may be aware, one of the initiatives in my portfolio deals with the private provision of public infrastructure. That may well be a way of advancing a number of projects that would otherwise not be undertaken.

As the member would also be aware, the levy on sewage has enabled a number of sewage treatment works to be completed well in advance of what otherwise might have been the case. There are a number of areas where we have acted to try to advance capital works past the point where it is absolutely necessary and into the realm of the desirable rather than the necessary.

I refer to the two premises that are currently occupied by ETSA and E&WS as their headquarters. Clearly, those buildings will still be needed because we are not halving the numbers in the merged organisation. It is distinctly possible that some free space will be available in each of those buildings if the numbers drop sufficiently. In that case we will put those spare floors on the lease market, either for other Government accommodation or for private accommodation. We will either avoid the cost of accommodation or we will get some income. I shall have to take the exact figures on notice. That was not so closely connected to the merger that I felt it was necessary to bring in those figures.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have one more question on clause 13. The Minister will be delighted to know that we have finished the list that I had associated with the functions of the organisation. This question relates to water quality and the effective disposal of sewage so that it does not enter into the streams and the gulf and kill off the seagrasses and deplete our fishing and breeding stocks. In the functions of the corporation two major items seem to be missing. The first is that there is no reference to efficient production. We have talked about the generation, transmission, supply and purchase of electricity and about the efficient use of water, but nowhere have we talked about efficiency of production or supply in relation to electricity and water. I find that quite unusual. In fact, it is a major omission from the Bill.

The second point, which the Minister may find difficult to swallow given that we have been talking about cost savings which I have not accepted, is that there is no demand on the corporation to achieve a competitive situation interstate. The Minister says that because we are going to do these things and save this money—which we refute—somehow the organisation will be able to deliver water and electricity at competitive prices interstate. However, that is not the point. The point is that somewhere in the document we should have positive statements about what is intended to be achieved. Neither of those items has been addressed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: It is normal for the functions of an organisation to be specified in its Act. In this situation we also have the Public Corporations Act, which provides the capacity to put together a charter between the Minister and the corporation. I can assure the honourable

member that the word 'efficiency' will appear there. It is not just my wish that these two organisations should be efficient; it is also their wish. Indeed, both organisations have been striving towards efficiency for as long as I can remember. I do not think that we have a problem there. World's best practice is clearly in the minds of both organisations to do all manner of things as efficiently as possible. It is part of their *raison d'être*. The charter, which will be written up between the Minister and the Southern Power and Water Authority, will require them to be as efficient as is humanly possible and, indeed, to ensure that the efficiencies can be tested in some way so that they can be demonstrated instead of just indicated.

Mr S.J. BAKER: As the Bill is to go to a select committee, I will not thrust forward on this point as I normally would. However, I believe the Minister should consider putting words into this Bill which clearly show the intention of the corporation. I believe that if we want the corporation to succeed we should set goals for it. The items in the corporation's charter must include the word 'efficient' and the word 'competitive' in terms of pricing as an aiming point, desire or output from the corporation. Further, there is no reference to the responsibility for proper and adequate accounting for all the functions so that they can be properly priced.

You might argue that that third item—proper accounting—does not necessarily relate to functions. I would say it does relate very specifically to the functions, because we are talking about the price at which water, electricity and sewerage will be charged, and of course a large number of ancillary costs will be involved. The Minister is quite right. He said earlier that there is a capacity to get together certain common areas and charge out, just like the Government computing centre, for example, takes agency service from a number of departments and charges them out. However, we should really put in the role of the function of the corporation some specific goals. I do not expect the Minister to jump up and down and say, 'Yes, that's a good idea'; all I am asking is that he should consider it.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I am always willing to consider things. I think the honourable member would agree with me that it is the result that matters rather than the form. The form has been covered in the sense that the legislation, when it is enacted, will be subject to the Public Corporations Act, and under the Public Corporations Act a charter will be set between the Minister and the corporation. Any Minister worth his salt will insist on the maximum amount of efficiency and effectiveness that you can get out of an organisation. I think that, no matter who happens to be in my chair at some given time or other, that person will always require the corporation to be as effective and as efficient as possible. Perhaps just for the honourable member's guidance I will read out section 13 of the Public Corporations Act.

Mr S.J. Baker: I am talking about the general overriding considerations.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Well, this is much clearer than that; it talks about performance statements. It provides:

The corporation's Minister and the Treasurer must, when preparing the charter for public corporation, also prepare, after consultation with the corporation, a performance statement setting the various performance targets that the corporation is to pursue in the coming financial year or other periods specified in the statements and dealing with such other matters as the Minister and the Treasurer consider appropriate.

That is in the Public Corporations Act, and this legislation is subject to that Act.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The last question I have on clause 13—unless the Minister incites me to ask more (and it is a matter I will address more specifically when we get to the Water Resources Act)—involves the fact that there appears to be no divisional responsibility in this Bill between the function of maintaining the infrastructure to provide good quality water and the responsibility of the Minister to ensure that the water is of the best quality. Simply, the Engineering and Water Supply Department has all the assets and all the research staff.

When we take the assets and put them with the new corporation, the corporation is responsible for the maintenance of those assets. However, the Minister remains responsible for water resources and the quality thereof. Should there be some reference in this Bill to completely clarify the situation? As I said, when we get to the Water Resources Act I will discuss this matter in somewhat more depth. However, I believe there is some confusion, given that the corporation was responsible for all the things that were going to assist in improving the water quality, but there are no guarantees because the Minister himself is responsible for water quality.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think this matter is best pursued at a later time, and I do not particularly want to make a lengthy statement about it, because I am desperately trying to avoid enraging the honourable member into another five hours worth of questions. The situation is that, in order for me to provide good quality water, I need appropriate assets. Those assets, as the honourable member has pointed out, will be transferred to the new corporation, and the people who will make it work may still be under my control as Minister and may still be part of the E&WS, but they will be made available to the organisation. I think this is one of those areas where everybody will be working with the best will in the world because everybody has as their *raison d'être* the need to produce the cleanest, best water they possibly can.

Clause passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16—‘The corporation not liable to pay amounts equivalent to certain rates.’

Mr S.J. BAKER: I have a question in my own mind about who will be paying rates to whom. If we are talking about 1 Anzac Highway, will it be subject to the rates under this Bill and, if it still owns the property on Greenhill Road, whether it would still be paying rates on that property? I can use better examples, but if it still owned the Greenhill Road property that would not be used for administrative purposes and therefore would lie outside the purview of this, but 1 Anzac Highway remains within.

As I understand it, the Electricity Trust does in fact pay rates to the Government on all its properties. Can the Minister clarify this situation? In the same vein does it mean that all the properties outside 1 Anzac Highway have to pay rates and how does that compare to the current situation?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must thank the honourable member for raising the issue: if Greenhill Road was not in use would it have to pay rent or not. That is ingenious and I give him full credit for that. With regard to this clause I need to point out that we did have what was in effect a confused situation. We had a situation where ETSA paid rates to local councils for some of its infrastructure, and not for the rest. I think the honourable member is right, that it paid a rate equivalent to the Treasurer for the rest. The E&WS being a Government organisation would end up paying almost no rates.

One of the things that I wanted to short circuit was a complex argument about what rates should be paid to Treasury. The best way to avoid that was to include this clause. Since Treasury is negotiating with local government regarding what rates should be paid there is an indication that local government will not suffer as a result of this merger. Since one either pays money to the Treasurer as a rate equivalent above the line or pays a dividend below the line it really does not matter very much in my view as to when we pay money out to Treasury. That is why I inserted the clause that the corporation is not liable to pay equivalence to Treasury. With regard to the Eastwood situation, it has just been put in front of me that the settlement is due at the end of August. If the settlement does take place that is not going to be a problem.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I am confused. I will have to look at the Minister's answer on that. If the E&WS is occupying Australis Centre and E&WS own Australis Centre one would presume it would have to pay rates on Australis Centre. I think I have that right. But if we talk about all the depots, all the manufacturing plant, where they keep their pipes, the storage sheds, then they do not have to pay rates. The new corporation does not have to pay rates to the Treasurer. ETSA would have to pay rates to the Treasurer under this Bill only on No. 1 Anzac Highway.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Under this Bill no rates are payable to Treasury. That is what the clause says. The reason for that is, I believe, whether or not the corporation pays a rate equivalent to the Treasurer above the line or pays a larger dividend below the line is largely irrelevant. The money travels through if it is not paid above the line. The honourable member probably understands more about that than I do. But, clearly, if there is a dividend to be paid at the end, even a notional rate equivalent is taken into consideration. That does not fuss me unduly. But it was to avoid the confusion that the honourable member refers to that I included that provision.

Clause passed.

Clause 17—‘Staff of the corporation.’

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister would recognise that this is one clause about which there has been considerable comment. The Opposition has received numerous letters and telephone calls from people in the Engineering and Water Supply Department, because under the Bill ETSA employees as of right are admitted to the new corporation whereas E&WS employees will be admitted to the corporation by invitation or as needed. Certainly the unions have contacted us about this situation. However, we have had a briefing on the matter and what I do not understand is that we have been told that this is a greenfield site, which means nobody gets through the door except by invitation. If that is a greenfield site, nobody has a right to go through that door. What is the prevailing situation? Is it a greenfield site so that only people whom the Government through the merger committees feels are suitable will be admitted, irrespective of whether they are ETSA or E&WS employees; or will all the ETSA employees be admitted and the E&WS employees eased through the front door; or is there some combination of the two?

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Of course, the situation is that we happen to have a statutory authority and a Government department merging into a statutory authority. It is therefore reasonably easy to take people who are already in a statutory authority and nominate them to be part of the new statutory authority. In a sense, of course, they are not going into positions in that new statutory authority, and the

greenfield situation takes place there. Everybody will move in and then positions will be advertised or whatever, in much the same way as ETSA went through its process of layer by layer putting in a structure and inviting people to apply for positions within that structure.

The E&WS people were subject to conditions, under the Government Management and Employment Act, that they were keen not to sacrifice without some considerable consideration. Consequently, subclause (6) was inserted to enable them to have a staged entry into the new corporation. But indeed, if there are some people who would rather not move in at all, that is also possible.

Mr S.J. BAKER: I understood all that; that was consistent with the briefing, and all I can say is that it is not a greenfield site. I understand that there are some practicalities involved here. I understand that there we have a trust and that we have to have a new corporate body which can assume control of the trust, but let us not call it a greenfield site, for goodness sake, because there is no capacity to leave the ETSA employees outside. However, there is certainly a capacity to leave the E&WS employees outside. There was an untruth. It is not like the submarine site where everybody did some bargaining and said, 'Look, we will have a true greenfield site here. We will get all the unions together; we will sort it out; we will have a scheme of arrangement; and we will work cooperatively together.'

It is not like the submarine site, which was fresh and new. Obviously the practicalities of the situation mean that ETSA employees are within the corporation and E&WS employees are not. I do not wish to labour the point. It is normally a clause on which we would call for a division because, as the E&WS employees would quite rightly say, they are being treated unfairly and as second class citizens. The Minister would respond by saying, 'We need to do this because the law requires it.' As an employee, I would rather be inside the corporation struggling for position than on the outside waiting for the door to open.

I think the point must be made and made very strongly that ETSA employees do have a pride of place; E&WS do not. There will have to be a large number involved—at least 714 according to this document, but the document is flawed. We do not know; the Minister might be talking about 1 000, or even more, who will have to be on the redundancy list or on the unplaced list as a result of the changes. That is the only option available unless those people leave the organisation in the interim.

The Opposition believes that the second reading speech was misleading. I said at the very beginning: if we had been misled, or if there was something doubtful about the clause, we would oppose it. However, as this matter is going to a select committee, we ask the Minister to rethink how he can give employees of both organisations, particularly E&WS employees, a greater deal of comfort than they feel today, because all the correspondence has obviously come from that quarter—from people who do not know about their future and who do not know when the door will be opened. I expect that the manager of the merger team, Mr Phipps, as the Chief Executive Officer will spend a great deal of time on this aspect.

Despite having got employees together and having a face-to-face, we have received further correspondence from those who attended those gatherings that they are not satisfied with the deal. It will need a lot of work, and the Minister will have plenty of time because the select committee will take two or three months. But I hope that he gets this aspect right and that

he starts to tell employees the truth about what they face and about the options they may have to take up so that they can feel a little more comfortable than they feel today.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I think I can put the honourable member's concerns to rest. While it is true to say that ETSA employees will become employees of the organisation called Southern Power and Water, when they become members of that organisation, when they move under that umbrella, they will not be part of the new greenfields Southern Power and Water. They will be able to apply for positions in that organisation. So, the honourable member really has to think in terms of various blocks inside the umbrella and people being able—

Mr S.J. Baker interjecting:

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: We also have to recognise that we do not have a greenfields site like the Submarine Corporation because we are not going to flatten out all the power stations and start again. We have a situation where people are in positions where the work of those positions needs to be continued. But we are starting a greenfields situation inside SPW and the people who are either from ETSA and already employees of that umbrella organisation or from the E&WS will be able to apply.

I have to tell the honourable member that subclause (6) was inserted at the request of the Government Management Act employees, because they could see, as the honourable member indicated, that some of them might become redundant. They saw the opportunity of being able to move within the wider Public Service and finding another position there as more preferable than being inside the Southern Power and Water authority and having to look for other positions. So, that was done in order to give them virtually a double choice—they would be able to move either way as they wished. That is why we have allowed for a staged entry into the umbrella of Southern Power and Water.

So, to call them second rate employees I think is very unfair because they are, in effect, getting two bites at the cherry, and that was done at their specific request.

Clause passed.

Clause 18—'Delegation to corporation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: This clause provides:

The Minister may delegate any of the Minister's powers or functions under any Act to the corporation.

I am not sure of the relevance of this provision. I understand that the Minister is thinking about the Water Resources Act here.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: Yes, I am and there will be certain powers that I may from time to time wish to delegate and other powers that I will not, and of course I have a power to resume. It does not derogate from my power to Act in my matter and is revokable at will. So, that is just something that will make life a little easier.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Schedule 1—'Superannuation.'

Mr S.J. BAKER: The issue of superannuation is a very important one. I know that the Minister responded, when closing the second reading debate, to the issues that I had raised about how we would preserve the assets of the Electricity Trust Superannuation Trust Fund. As the Minister pointed out, much of the schedule is duplication of what exists, and I did not question that at all, despite the Minister's response. When I looked at Part 3, Division 2, 'Payment of Contributions and Benefits', I saw that it was quite clear that

all contributions for Southern Power and Water shall be paid to the Treasurer.

It raises the question of how we will continue to preserve the benefits of those people who transfer across as ETSA employees. It also raises the question as to who can actually draw on the ETSA trust fund. So, as one of my last blows for the evening, I would like the Minister to explain how we will not have taxpayers subjected to enormous liabilities and have them further extended by this proposition. We know, for example, that as of 30 June 1992 the superannuation liabilities were about \$3.5 billion. I expect when the budget comes down tomorrow that it will be about \$3.9 billion or even \$4 billion of superannuation liabilities which categorically simply cannot be afforded but which will have to be met by a diminishing budget.

The only fortunate aspect of that is that they are not all coming on stream at once and our children will have the pleasure of paying for the liabilities that have been built up over the past 20 years. The point I wish to make about this is that we do not now wish a further burden to be placed on the taxpayers. We have had a fully funded ETSA scheme, and there is no guarantee whatsoever that that fully funded scheme will continue for the 4 000 ETSA employees if indeed there is a movement into the South Australian superannuation scheme or if there is not proper preservation within the existing trust scheme. My fear is that not only will the Government grab a slice of the action in the trust fund to pay for the outgoing but also it will have greater liabilities building up within the public sector scheme.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: There are a number of questions there, and I indicated in my response to the second reading that my understanding was that these were in fact very much a direct translation from the existing provisions. I am assured that the provision that contributions payable pursuant to the rules must be paid to the Treasurer is an existing situation, so that has not changed due to the merger.

Mr S.J. Baker: The actuality is that they are credited against the trust funds.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: No. The situation is that the Treasurer also pays all superannuation benefits, and is in fact reimbursed by ETSA. The honourable member is returning to his fear that a Government, of whatever persuasion I take it, will be able to dip into the fund. All I can say to him is that the capacity of a Government to do so has not changed as a result of this merger. There will still be this particular fund. It is still going to have those assets in it, and the Government of the day has exactly the same power of dipping into that as it used to have under the ETSA Act, so there has been no change as a result of the merger.

Mr S.J. BAKER: The Minister is not correct, because he cannot guarantee that the jobs of 3 500 or 4 000 will be preserved in that scheme, which persons will continue to contribute to the scheme, and that it will still be, if the organisation is 7 000 strong in 10 years time, a fully funded contributory scheme relating to half the employees; he knows that that will not be the case. That is a fact of life, so all we do is build up the liabilities, and we do not have the authority paying its full dues. I refer to the farce that goes on in our accounts, where there is some mention that there has been superannuation liability just to show the cost of salary provisions.

The facts of life are that ever since this State began (I have not gone back 150 years to determine exactly when people were first paid salaries), as far as I am aware, no contribution has been made by the Government to offset the existing and increasing liabilities that are borne by the Government. So, I am correct. I am absolutely correct that here is another example of where the tax payer will pay the burden.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER: I must admit that I have some difficulty in understanding the honourable member. At the moment ETSA has a fully funded scheme, and when anyone joins that the scheme would continue to remain fully funded. People who wish to remain in the State scheme, of course, remain therein, and even if they become employees of the authority they would, as I indicated under section 5 of the State scheme, be able to continue belonging to that scheme.

So, yes, the cost of both superannuation schemes eventually comes back either to the taxpayer or to the person who pays for electricity, and in that sense, whatever the costs are, they come back in that fashion. I thought that the situation was relatively clear.

Schedule passed.

Schedule 2 and title passed.

The Hon. J.H.C. KLUNDER (Minister of Public Infrastructure): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The House divided on the third reading:

AYES (21)

Arnold, L.M.F.	Atkinson, M.J.
Bannon, J.C.	Blevins, F.T.
De Laine, M.R.	Evans, M.J.
Ferguson, D.M.	Gregory, R.J.
Groom, T. R.	Hamilton, K. C.
Heron, V. S.	Holloway, P.
Hopgood, D. J.	Hutchison, C. F.
Klunder, J. H. C. (teller)	Lenehan, S. M.
Mayes, M. K.	McKee, C. D. T.
Quirke, J. A.	Rann, M. D.
Trainer, J. P.	

NOES (21)

Allison, H.	Armitage, M. H.
Arnold, P. B.	Baker, D. S.
Baker, S. J. (teller)	Becker, H.
Blacker, P. D.	Brindal, M. K.
Cashmore, J. L.	Eastick, B. C.
Evans, S. G.	Gunn, G. M.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Oswald, J. K. G.
Such, R. B.	Venning, I. H.
Wotton, D. C.	

PAIRS

Crafter, G. J.	Brown, D. C.
Hemmings, T. H.	Olsen, J. W.

The SPEAKER: There being 21 Ayes and 21 Noes, I cast my vote for the Ayes.

Third reading thus carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday 26 August at 10.30 a.m.